VOL 2 OF 11

No. 74851

## PATRICK HENRY MURPHY, JR.

APPELLANT

CAPITAL MURDER
OFFENSE

**DEATH**PUNISHMENT

CONTENTS: RR VOLS. 1 - 9

DALLAS

74851

## REPORTER'S RECORD

## VOLUME 1 OF 61 VOLUMES

TRIAL COURT CAUSE NO. F01-00328-T

STATE OF TEXAS \* IN THE DISTRICT COURT

VS. \* DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS

\*\*\*\*\*\*

COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

283RD DISTRICT COURT

MASTER INDEX

MAR 9 - 2004

Troy C. Bennett, Jr., Clerk

13

14

15

16

17

18

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

PATRICK HENRY MURPHY, JR.

On the 10th day of November, 2003, the following proceedings came on to be heard in the above-entitled and numbered cause before the Honorable Vickers L. Cunningham, Sr., Judge Presiding, held in Dallas, Dallas County, Texas.

Proceedings reported by machine shorthand.

20

19

21

22

23

25

ORIGINAL

## APPEARANCES 1 APPEARING FOR THE STATE 2 Mr. Toby Shook 3 SBOT NO. 18293250 And ' 4 Mr. Bill Wirskye SBOT NO. 00788696 5 Assistant District Attorneys 133 No. Industrial Blvd. 6 Dallas, Texas 75207 Phone: 214/653-3600 7 8 APPEARING FOR THE DEFENDANT 9 Ms. Brook Busbee Attorney at Law 10 SBOT: 03488000 703 McKinney Ave. Ste. 312 11 Dallas, TX 75202 214/754-9090 12 Mr. Juan Sanchez 13 Attorney at Law SBOT: 00791599 14 5630 Yale Blvd. Dallas, TX 75206 15 214/365-0700 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

1	<u>CHRONOI</u>	OGICAI	INDEX		
2			PAGE	<u>[</u>	VOL.
3	Master Index				1
4	Pretrial Hearing				2
5	Pretrial Hearing				3
6	Pretrial Hearing				4
7	General Panel Questionnaires	\$			5
. 8	General Panel Questionnnaire	s .			6
9	Individual Voir Dire:				
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR	CRT	STATE	DEFENSE	VOL.
11	Christopher O'Neal	5	7		7
12	Carole Lawson	8	10	33	7
13 -	David Shannon	56	58	88	7
14	Barbara Holcombe	97	99	132	7.
15	Eugene Peterson	138	140		7
16	Jill Ann Ervin	153	155	•	7
17	Georgia Portillo	4	5		8
18	Mary Sullivan	25	27		8
19	Jamie Garber	34	35	65	8
20	Brad Richards	74	75	101	8
21	Glenn Hamman	117	119	151	8
22	Phillip Emery	4	6	42	9
23	Erica Hefner	64	66		9
24	Marty Ingle	76	80	114	9
25	Frankie Freeland	124	126		9

1	Susanne Krupihnski	136	138		9
2	Dona Garrett	147	148		9
3	Rebecca Garza-Salas	4	6		10
4	Wendee Leigh Stringer	25	28	52	10
5	Yvette Morton	57	59		10
6	Brenda Echols	73	74		10
7	Keith Pelusi	4	5	21	11
8	Donna-Marie Sexton	22	23	45	11
9	Deborah Pruett	46	48	77	11
10	Frank Arena	82	83	104	11
11 .	Christine Stucker	107	108	134	11
12	Everett Hulsey	4	5	37	.12
13	Raymond Capetillo	45	47		12
14	Margaret Rehwinkel	54	57	88	12
15	Kathryn Ryan	108	109		12
16	Alicia Curtis	112	114	145	12
17	Linda Patterson	150	152		12
18	Michael Collins	4	5	35	13
19	Clarence Davis	42	43		13
20	Christopher Thompson	46	49	71	13
21	Antwanette Coleman	75	77		13
22	Wayland Taylor	85	88		13
23	James Nelson	99	101	133	13
24	Lisa Crawford	4	6	35	14
25	Don Jones	48	49	75	14

. 1	Roy Davis	95	96		14
2	David Evans	104	106	134	14
3	Nancy Carney	155	157	193	14
4	Virginia Farr	4	5		15
5	Margaret Johnson	18	20		15
6	Timothy Yancey	77	80		15
7 7	David Karwoski	89	90		15
8	Victoria Thompson	103	106		15
9	J. Robert DeRossett	6	8	47	16
10	Shirley Miller	61	63	96	16
11	Kathie Burkhalter	98	102		16
12	Sylvia Weaver	103	105		16
13	Julie Danka	126	128		16
14	Tonya Godbehere	4	5		17
15	Trae Hamilton	16	17		17
16	Monica Ortega	37	38		17
17	Misty Glidewell	57	60		17
18	Annette Watson	75	74		17
19	Ben Ortiz	92	94	125	17
20	Louise Marker	4	5	40	18
21	Kyle McCoy	76	77		18
22	Tonya Davis	85	87	123	18
23	Dana Stotts	134	137	·	18
24	Floyd Fuller	148	150	179	18
25	Douglas Kolpanen	4	5		19

					<del> </del>
1	Pamela Martin	34	-38		19
2	Ruth Culver	54	56		19
3	Kevin Harper	60	62	99	19
4	Lorna Lankford	116	117	148	19
5	George Nash	157	158		19
6	Ronna Braggs	4	5	41	20
7	Sandra Paredes	45	47		20
8	Stephen Owens	67	69		20
9	Angel Chinuntdet	71	73	95	20
10	Jeffry Wingate	99	100	135	20
11	Sharon Hudgens	143	144 ·	181	20
12	Burley Morvant,Jr.	4	5		21
13	William Hodges	16	17		21
14	Flora Williams	31	29		21
15	Johnny Silva	43	41		21
16	Gary Danaher	58	56		21
17	Susan Braley	4	5	•	22
18	Scott Mattinely	25	26	38	22
19	Judy Liston	48	45	89	22
20	Walter Thomas	103	104	138	22
21	Bradley Versteeg	144	145		22
22	Cathryn Mitchell	4	5	43	23
23	Diane Courtney	54	55		23
24	Michael Smith	92	93	122	23
25	Nelda Pitts	4	5		24

					·	
1	Sandra Geeslin		14	17		24
2	Gayle Melara		19	20		24
3	Carol Cunningham		29	31	69	24
4	Bonny Martin		97	99		24
5	Jan Anderson		112	116		24
6	General Panel Questionn	aires	}			25
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR	CRT.		STATE	DEFENSE	<u>VOL</u> .
8	Grace Evans	4		5	36	26
9	Linda Rowell	41		43,95	75,96	26
10	Mark Poole	99		100	136	26
11	Hardy Walker, Jr.	145		146	177	26
12	Sandra Barron	194	. *	196	236	26
13	Nancy Wilkey	241		242,271 276	261,274	26
14	Robin Sterling	4		210	290	27
15	Jennifer Dillon	10		12		27
16	Sandra Landers	21		23	45	27
17	Dee Dee Wheeler	47		48		27
18	Julia Laux	55		57		27
19	General Panel Questionn	aires		•		28
20	Roberto Ramirez	4	1	6		29
21	Lisa Taylor	24		26		29
22	Donna Hyde	43		45		29
23	Derek Lackey	54	-	56		29
24	James Sartor	4	•	5		30
25	Lana Marshall	11		14		30
ı			*	•		

	<u> </u>				
1	Keith Rabuse	19	21		30
2	Andrea Canady	37	38		30
3	George Navarro	44	47	81	30
4	Marisela Alaniz	87	89		30
5	General Panel Questionr	naires			31
6	Andrea Miller	4	6		32
7	Margaret Rasmussen	24	26		32
8	Lawrence Bosworth	53	54	89	32
9	James Grace	99	100	129	32
10	Lynda Abbott	144	145	152	32
11	Elvin Slette	155	157		32
12	Michael Nichols	4	5	42	33
13	Micheaux Glosson	69	70		33
14	Virginia Brown	78	81		33
15	Scott Albright	85	86	125	33
16	Maribel Willis	138	140	162	33
17	Angela Hacker	4	5		34
18	Jay Gossage	27	29		34
19	Dominga Saucedo	52	53		34
20	Brian Simmons	66	67	92	34
21	Roger Gordon	96	98	120	34
22	Nathaniel Williams	5 .	6		35
23	Kenny Martin	4	6	•	35
24	Elaine Crooks	22	23		35
25	Jan Sims	26	28	68	35
į					- 1

1	Edward Campbell	77	79	109	35
2	Deloris Ellis	<b>4</b> ·	5		36
3	Timothy Becher	9	10	49	36
4	John' Henderson	65	66		36
5	Kathy Fitzgerald	77	79	102	36
6	Sylvester Patton	112	114		36
7	Nicholas Daigle	<b>4</b>	5	25	37
8	Lawrence Porter	31	32	46	37
9	Elizabeth Bastardo	49	50		37
10,	Juror Orientation and P	retrial			38
11	WITNESS	STATE	DEFENSE	<u>VD</u>	VOL.
12	Randall Johnson	48,68	55,89		38
13		88			
14	Patrick Murphy	68,87	75	82	38
15	Juror Qualification Hea	ring			39
16	Jury Trial:				
17	Arraignment			8	40
18	Opening Statement:				
19	State			9	40
20	State's Witnesses:				
21	WITNESS	DIRE	CT CROS	<u>ss</u>	VOL.
22	Jayne Hawkins	26,3	6 33		40
23	Wes Ferris	36,9	3 91		40
24	Tim Cassout	96.	112		40
25	Dennis Norton	114	126		40
l				•	

		<u> </u>		
1	Randall Johnson	129		40
2		11	<b>5</b>	41
3	Misty Simpson	15,29	28	41
4	Michael Simpson	30	44	41
5	Marquis Washington	45,59	59	41
6	Steven Hazard	60,122	120	41
7	Curtis Chism	123		41
8	Jeffrey Barnard	5,31	30	42
9	Brett Mills	32	46	42
10	Timothy Sliter	47	63	42
11	David Spence	64		42
12	James Garcia	84		42
13	Steve Bode	80	102	42
14	Frank Fehn	103	114	42
15	Roddy Alford	116		42
16	William Petoskey	131	144	42
17	James Mahoney	145		42
18	Miles Gooderham	188		42
19	Lannie Emanuel	194	213	42
20	Jim Stinson	3,46	16,44	43
21	Matt Harrell	27,47	31,50	43
22	John Ford	52	66	43
23	Stephen DiRito	68	79	43
24	Jeff Spivey	81	87	43
25	State Rests		88	43

1	Defense Rests		88	43
2	All Close		88	43
3	Jury Charge Read		8	44
4	Final Arguments:			
5	Mr. Wirskye		8	44
6	Mr. Sanchez		19	44
, 7	Mr. Shook		31	44
8	Verdict		41	44
9	Punish Phase:			
10	Troy Graham	16	26	45
11	Holly Becka	28,32	29	45
12	Jeannie Grieser	35		45
13	Donald Kearney	72		45
14	Bill Brown	84	95	45
15	Timothy Sliter	94		45
16	Patrick Moczygemba	102	151	45
17	Mark Burgess	5	20	46
18	Martin Gilley	22		46
19	Vernon Janssen	32		46
20	Rita Samaniego	45,51,60	57 48	46
21	John Kemp	61,82	81,83	46
22	Larry Jaramillo	85		46
23	Kurt Bonsal	94,99	98	46
24	Holly Becka	10,11	14	47
25	Christie Wimsatt	35		47

				<u> </u>
1	Oscar Riveria	41	47	47
2	Harry Sanchez	48		47
3	John Davis	56		47
4	Jeff Spivey	61		47
5	State Rests		66	47
6	Defense Witnesses:			
7	Linda Goodman	70	110	47
8	S. O. Woods	120,175	156	47
9.	George Rivas	6,87,95	29,90	48
10	Dot wiele Marches Co	96	114	4.0
11	Patrick Murphy, Sr.	99,121	114	48
12	Mark Vigen	231	167,232	48
13 14	Defense Rests		7	49
15	All Close		16	49
16	Final Arguments:			
17	Mr. Shook		17	49
18	Mr. Sanchez		36	49
19	Ms. Busbee		39	49
20	Mr. Wirskye		57	49
21	Verdict		79	49
22	Sentence		81	49
23	Motion for New Trial			50
24	Reporter's Certificate		4	61
25		•		

26

ALPHABETICAL	PROSPECTIVE	<b>JURORS</b>
--------------	-------------	---------------

	. \ •			<del></del>	
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR	CRT	STATE	DEFENSE	VOL.
.	Lynda Abbott	144	145	152	32
5	Marisela Alaniz	87	89		30
5	Scott Albright	85	86	125	33
,	Jan Anderson	112	116		24
3	Frank Arena	82	83	104	11
,	Sandra Barron	194	196	236	26
,	Elizabeth Bastardo	49	50		37
	Timothy Becher	9	10	49	36
2	Lawrence Bosworth	53	54	89	32
	Ronna Braggs	4	5	41	20
•	Susan Braley	4	5	·	22
,	Virginia Brown	78	81		33
	Kathie Burkhalter	98	102		16
٠	Edward Campbell	77	79	109	35
	Andrea Canady	37	38		30
	Raymond Capetillo	45	47		12
	Nancy Carney	155	157	193	14
	Angel Chinuntdet	71	73	95	20
	Antwanette Coleman	75	77		13
	Michael Collins	4	5	35	13
	Diane Courtney	54	55		23
	Lisa Crawford	4	6	35	14

1.	Elaine Crooks	22	23		35	
2	Ruth Culver	54	56		19	
3	Carol Cunningham	29	.31	69	24	
4	Alicia Curtis	112	114	145	12	
5	Nicholas Daigle	4	5	25	37	
6	Gary Danaher	58	56	.*	21	
7	Julie Danka	126	128		16	
8.	Clarence Davis	42	43		13	
9	Roy Davis	95	96		14	
10	Tonya Davis	85	87	123	18	-
11	J. Robert DeRossett	6	8	47	16	
12	Jennifer Dillon	10	12		27	
13	Brenda Echols	73	74		10	
14	Deloris Ellis	4	5		36	
15	Phillip Emery	4	6	42	9	
16	Jill Ann Ervin	153	155		7 7	
17	David Evans	104	106	134	14	
18	Grace Evans	4	5	36	26	
19	Virginia Farr	4	5		15	
20	Kathy Fitzgerald	77	79	102	36	
21	Frankie Freeland	124	126		9	
22	Floyd Fuller	148	150	179	18	
23	Jamie Garber	34	35	65	8	
24	Dona Garrett	147	148		9	
25	Rebecca Garza-Salas	4	6		10	
				4		. ]

1	Sandra Geeslin	14	17		24
2	Misty Glidewell	57	60		17
3	Micheaux Glosson	69	70	•	33
4	Tonya Godbehere	4	5		17
5	Roger Gordon	96	98	120	34
6	Jay Gossage	27	29		34
7	James Grace	99	100	129	32
8, ,	Angela Hacker	4	5		34
9	Trae Hamilton	16	17	•	17
10	Glenn Hamman	117	119	151	8
11	Kevin Harper	60	62	99	19
12	Erica Hefner	64	66		9
13	John Henderson	65	66		36
14	William Hodges	16	17		21
15	Barbara Holcombe	97	99	132	7
16	Sharon Hudgens	143	144	181	20
17	Everett Hulsey	4	5	37	12
18	Donna Hyde	43	45		29
19	Marty Ingle	76	80	114	9
20	Margaret Johnson	18	20		15
21	Don Jones	48	49	75	14
22	David Karwoski	89	90		15
23	Douglas Kolpanen	4	5		19
24	Susanne Krupihnski	136	138		9
25	Derek Lackey	54	56		29
l					

				the second secon	
1	Sandra Landers	21	23	45	27
2	Lorna Lankford	116	117	148	19
3	Julia Laux	55	57		27
4	Carole Lawson	8	10	33	, <b>7</b>
5	Judy Liston	48	45	89	22
6	Louise Marker	4	5	40	18
7	Lana Marshall	11	14		30
8	Bonny Martin	97	99		24
9	Kenny Martin	4	6	:	35
10	Pamela Martin	34	38		19
11	Scott Mattinely	25	26	38	22
12	Kyle McCoy	76	77		18
13	Gayle Melara	19	20		24
14	Andrea Miller	4	6		32
15	Shirley Miller	61	63	96	16
16	Cathryn Mitchell	4	5	43	23
17	Yvette Morton	57	59		10
18	Burley Morvant, Jr.	4 , ,	5		21
19	George Nash	157	158		19
20	George Navarro	44	47	81	30
21	James Nelson	99	101	133	13
22	Michael Nichols	4	5	42	33
23	Christopher O'Neal	, 5	7		7
24	Monica Ortega	37	38		17
25	Ben Ortiz	92	94	125	17

1	Stephen Owens	67	69		20
2	Sandra Paredes	45	47		20
3	Linda Patterson	150	152		12
4	Sylvester Patton	112	114		36
5 5	Keith Pelusi	4	5	21	11
6	Eugene Peterson	138	140		7
7	Nelda Pitts	4	5		24
8	Mark Poole	99	100	136	26
9	Lawrence Porter	31	32	46	37
10	Georgia Portillo	4	5		8
11	Deborah Pruett	46	48	77	11
12	Keith Rabuse	19	21		30
13	Roberto Ramirez	4	6		29
14	Margaret Rasmussen	24	26		32
15	Margaret Rehwinkel	54	57	88	12
16	Brad Richards	74	75	101	8
17	Linda Rowell	41	43,95	75,96	26
18	Kathryn Ryan	108	109		12
19	James Sartor	4	5		30
20	Dominga Saucedo	52	53		34
21	Donna-Marie Sexton	22	23	45	11
22	David Shannon	56	58	88	7
23	Johnny Silva	43	41		21
24	Brian Simmons	66	67	92	34
25	Jan Sims	26	28	68	35

				and the same of th	
1	Elvin Slette	155	157		32
2	Michael Smith	92	93	122	23
3	Robin Sterling	4			27
4	Dana Stotts	134	137		18
5	Wendee Leigh Stringer	25	28	52	10
6	Christine Stucker	107	108	134	11
7	Mary Sullivan	25	27		8
8	Lisa Taylor	24	26		29
9	Wayland Taylor	85	88		13
10	Walter Thomas	103	104	138	22
11	Christopher Thompson	46	49	71	13
12	Victoria Thompson	103	106		15
13	Bradley Versteeg	144	145		22
14	Hardy Walker, Jr.	145	146	177	26
15	Annette Watson	75	74		17
16	Sylvia Weaver	103	105		16
17	Dee Dee Wheeler	47	48		27
18	Nancy Wilkey	241	242,271	261,274	26
19	Flora Williams	31	276 29	290	21
20	Nathaniel Williams	5	6		35
21	Maribel Willis	138	140	162	33
22	Jeffry Wingate	99	100	135	20
23	Timothy Yancey	77	80	•	15
24		•			

283RD JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT 214/653-5863 NANCY BREWER, OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

25

1	<u>ALPHABETI</u>	CAL WITNESS	INDEX	
2	WITNESS	STATE	<u>DEFENSE</u> <u>VD</u>	<u>VOL</u>
3	Roddy Alford	116		42
4	Jeffrey Barnard	5,31	30	42
5	Holly Becka	28,32 10,11	29 14	45 47
6 7	Steve Bode	80	102	42
8	Kurt Bonsal	94,99	98	46
9	Bill Brown	84	95	45
10	Mark Burgess	5	20	46
11	Tim Cassout	96	112	40
12	Curtis Chism	123		41
13	John Davis	56		47
14	Stephen DiRito	68	79	43
15	Lannie Emanuel	194	213	42
16	Frank Fehn	103	114	42
17	Wes Ferris	36,93	91	40
18	John Ford	52	66	43
19	James Garcia	84		42
20	Martin Gilley	22		46
21	Miles Gooderham	188		42
22	Linda Goodman	70	110	47
23	Troy Graham	16	26	45
24	Jeannie Grieser	35		45
25	Matt Harrell	27,47	31,50	43

. 1	Jayne Hawkins	26,36	33	40
2	Steven Hazard	60,122	120	41
3	Vernon Janssen	32		46
. 4	Larry Jaramillo	85		46
5	Randall Johnson	48,68	55,89	38
6		88 129 11	5	40 41
7 8	Donald Kearney	72		45
9	John Kemp	61,82	81,83	46
10	James Mahoney	145		42
11	Brett Mills	32	46	42
12	Patrick Moczygemba	102	151	45
13	Patrick Murphy	68,87	75 82	38
14	Patrick Murphy, Sr.	99,121	114	48
15	Dennis Norton	114	126	40
16	William Petoskey	131	144	42
17	George Rivas	6,87,95,96	29,90	48
18	Boscar Riveria	41	47	47
19	Rita Samaniego	45,51,60 48	57	46
20	Harry Sanchez	48		47
21	Misty Simpson	15,29	28	41
22	Michael Simpson	30	44	41
23	Timothy Sliter	47 94	63	42 45
24 25	David Spence	64		42
26	Jeff Spivey	81 61	87	43 47
				2

				·	
1	Jim Stinson	-	3,46	16,44	43
2	Mark Vigen		126,136,231	167,232	48
3	Marquis Wash	ington	45,59	59	41
4	Christie Wims	satt	35		47
5	S. O. Woods		120,175	156	47
6				,	
7					
8					
9				•	
10					
11					
12					
13					
14				er.	
15					
16					
17					
18		ЕХНТ	BIT INDEX		
19	<u>EXHIBIT</u>	IDENT.	<u>OFFER</u>	ADMIT	<u>VOL</u> .
20	CRT.1	CLOSING STMT.	8	<u>ADMII</u> 8	39
	ST.6	PHOTO			
21			31	31	40
22	ST.7	PHOTO	31	31	40
23	ST.8	РНОТО	29	29	40
24	ST.9	PHOTO - OSHMAN		43	40
25	ST.10	PHOTO - OSHMAN	S 43	43	40

1	ST.11	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40	
2	ST.12	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40	•
3	ST.13	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40	-
4	ST.14	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40	
5	ST.15	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40	
6 ,	ST.16	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40	
7	ST.17	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40	
8	ST.18	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40	
9	ST.19	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40	
10	ST.20	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40	
11	ST.21	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40	
12	ST.22	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40	
13	ST.23	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40	
14	ST.24	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40	
15	ST.25	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40	
16	ST.26	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40	
17	ST.27	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40	
18	ST.28	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40	
19	ST.29	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40	
20	ST.30	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40	
21	ST.31	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40	
22	ST.32	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40	
23	ST.33	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40	
24	ST.34	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40	
25	ST.35	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40	
					-	

1	ST.36	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40
2	ST.37	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40
3	ST.38	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40
	ST.3 <sup>9</sup>	REVOLVER	60	60	40
4	ST.40	RADIO	60	60	40
5	ST.41	DEF. LINEUP	82	82	40
6	ST.43	DIAGRAM, OSHMANS	37	37	40
7	ST.44	РНОТО	51	51	40
8	ST.45	LINEUP	83	83	40
9	ST.46	POSTER OF GUNS	86	86	40
10	ST.47	POSTER OF GUNS	86	86	40
11	ST.48	POSTER OF GUNS	86	86	40
12	ST.49	PHOTO - EXPLORER	44	44	40
13	ST.50	PHOTO - EXPLORER	44	44	40
14	ST.51	РНОТО	97	97	40
15	ST.52	РНОТО	97	97	40
16	ST.53	РНОТО	97	97	40
17	ST.54	РНОТО	97	97	40
18	ST.55	PHOTO	97	97	40
19	ST.56	PHOTO	97	97	40
20	ST.57	РНОТО	97	97	40
21	ST.58	РНОТО	97	97	40
22	ST.59	VHS TAPE	121	121	40
23	ST.61	DISPATCH TAPE	123	123	40
24	ST.62	GLOCK HANDGUN	121	122	40
25				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

1	ST.65	PHOTO, APT.	46	46	41
2	ST.66	PHOTO, APT.	46	46	41
3	ST.67	DIAGRAMS, APT.	56	56	41
4		HANDDRAWN	30		11
5	ST.68	DIAGRAMS, APT. HANDDRAWN	56	56	41
6	ST.69	DIAGRAMS, APT. HANDDRAWN	56	56	41
7 8	ST.70	DIAGRAMS, APT. HANDDRAWN	56	56	41
9	ST.71	DIAGRAMS, APT. HANDDRAWN	56	56	41
10	ST.72	DIAGRAMS, APT. HANDDRAWN	56	56	41
	ST.73	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
12	ST.74	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
13	ST.75	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
14	ST.76	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
15	ST.77	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
16	ST.78	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
17	ST.79	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
18	ST.80	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
19	ST.81	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
20	ST.82	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
21	ST.83	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
22	ST.84	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
- 23	ST.85	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
24	ST.86	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
25					

1	ST.87	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
2	ST.88	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
3	ST.89	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
4	ST.90	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
5	ST.91	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
6	ST.92	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
7	ST.93	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
8	ST.94	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
9	ST.95	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
10	ST.96	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
11	ST.97	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
12	ST.98	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
13	ST.99	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
14	ST.100	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
15	ST.101	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
16	ST.102	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
17	ST.103	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
18	ST.104	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
19	ST.105	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
20	ST.106	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
21	ST.107	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
22	ST.108	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
23	ST.109	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
24	ST.110	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
25	ST.111	PAPERWORK, RV	64	64	41

1	ST.112	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
	ST.112	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
2					
3	ST.114	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
4	ST.115	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
5	ST.116	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
6	ST.117	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
7	ST.118	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
8	ST.119	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
9	ST.120	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
10	ST.121	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
11	ST.122	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
12	ST.123	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
13	ST.124	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
14	ST.125	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
15	ST.126	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
16	ST.127	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
17	ST.128	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
18	ST.129	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
19	ST.130	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
20	ST.131	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
21	ST.132	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
22	ST.133	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
23	ST.134	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
24	ST.135	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
25	ST.136	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41

			•	·	
_	CT 127	DUOTTO OGUMANIG		<i>-</i> <b>.</b>	4.7
. 1	ST.137	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
2	ST.138	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
3	ST.139	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
4	ST.140	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
5	ST.141	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
6	ST.142	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
7	ST.143	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
8	ST.144	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
9	ST.145	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
10	ST.146	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
11	ST.147	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
12	ST.148	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
13	ST.149	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
14	ST.150	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
15	ST.151	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
16	ST.152	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
17	ST.153	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
18	ST.154	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
19	ST.155	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
20	ST.156	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
21	ST.157	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
22	ST.158	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
23	ST.159	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
24	ST.160	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
25	ST.161	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41

1	ST.162	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
2	ST.163	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
3	ST.164	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
4.	ST.165	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
5	ST.166	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
6	ST.167	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
7	ST.168	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
8	ST.169	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
9	ST.170	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
10	ST.171	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
11	ST.172	PHOTO - OSHMANS	64	64	41
12	ST.173	DIAGRAM, CRIME SCENE	65	65	41
13	ST.174	OSHMANS VIDEOTAPE	70	70	41
14	ST.174-B	COPY OF OSHMANS VIDEOTAPE	70	70	41
16	ST.175	HAWKINS' BELT	89	89	41
17	ST.176	HAWKINS' RADIO	89	89	41
18	ST.177	HAWKINS' MAGAZINE CARRIER	89	89	41
19	ST.178	REVOLVER	76	77	41
20 21	ST.179	RADIO	87	87	41
22	ST.180	SCREWDRIVER	118	119	41
23	ST.182	FRAGMENTS	110	110	41
24	ST.183	SHELL CASINGS .	112	112	41
25	ST.184	PACKAGE	113	113	41
26	ST.184	FRAGMENTS	113	113	41

283RD JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT 214/653-5863 NANCY BREWER, OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

		- <u>-</u>			
. 1	A-B				
2	ST.185	PACKAGE	116	116	41
3	ST.185 A-D	BOTTLES, FRAGMENTS	116	116	41
4	ST.186	PACKAGE	117	117	41
5	ST.186 A-C	FRAGMENTS	117	117	41
6	ST.187	MAGNET POSTER	76	77	41
7	ST.188	PHOTO	93	93	42
8	ST.189	РНОТО	93	93	42
9	ST.192	РНОТО	8	8	42
10	ST.193	AUTOPSY PHOTO	8	8	42
11	ST.194	AUTOPSY PHOTO	8	8	42
12	ST.195	AUTOPSY PHOTO	8	8	42
13	ST.196	AUTOPSY PHOTO	8	8	42
14	ST.197	AUTOPSY PHOTO	8	8	42
15	ST.198	AUTOPSY PHOTO	8	8	42
16	ST.199	AUTOPSY PHOTO	8	8	42
17	ST.201	AUTOPSY PHOTO	8	8	42
18	ST.202	AUTOPSY PHOTO	8	8	42
19	ST.203	AUTOPSY PHOTO	8	8	42
20	ST.204	AUTOPSY PHOTO	8	8	42
21	ST.205	AUTOPSY PHOTO	8	8	42
22	ST.206	AUTOPSY PHOTO	8	8	42
23	ST.207	AUTOPSY PHOTO	8	8	42
24	ST.208	AUTOPSY PHOTO	8	8	42
25				_	

1	ST.209	MANNEQUIN	9	9	42
2	ST.210	FRAGMENTS	32	32	42
3	ST.211	FRAGMENTS	32	32	42
4	ST.212	FRAGMENTS	32	32	42
5	ST.213	FRAGMENTS	32	32	42
6	ST.214	FRAGMENTS	32	32	42
. 7	ST.215	FRAGMENTS	32	32	42
8	ST.216	FRAGMENTS	32	32	42
9	ST.217	FRAGMENTS	32	32	42
10	ST.218	FRAGMENTS	32	32	42
11	ST.219	FRAGMENTS	32	32	42
12	ST.220	FRAGMENTS	32	32	42
13	ST.221	PHOTO, LEATHER	66	66	42
14	ST.222	PHOTO, LEATHER DEFECT	66	66	42
15	ST.223	PHOTO BELT DEFECT	66	66	42
16	ST.224	PHOTO, CLIP	66	66	42
17	ST.225	PHOTO, BOOTS	66	66	42
18	ST.226	PHOTO, BOOTS	66	66	42
19	ST.227	PHOTO, VEST	66	66	42
20	ST.228	PHOTO, VEST	66	66	42
21	ST.229	PHOTO, VEST	66	66	42
22	ST.230	PHOTO, VEST DEFECT	66	66	42
24	ST.231	PHOTO, VEST DEFECT	66	66	42
25	ST.232	PHOTO, VEST	66	66	42
ļ				-	

_					
1	ST.233	PHOTO, VEST	66	66	42
2	ST.234	PHOTO, VEST	66	66	42
3	ST.235	PHOTO, CLOTHES	66	66	42
4	ST.236	PHOTO, CLOTHES	66	66	42
5	ST.237	PHOTO, CLOTHES	66	66	42
6	ST.240	VEST	77	77	42
7 <sup>.</sup> 8	ST.241	PHOTO, OSHMANS, VEHICLE	35	35	42
9	ST.242	PHOTO, OSHMANS, VEHICLE	35	35	42
0	ST.243	PHOTO, OSHMANS, VEHICLE	35	35	42
2	ST.244	PHOTO, OSHMANS, VEHICLE	35	35	42
3	ST.245	PHOTO, OSHMANS, VEHICLE	35	35	42
5	ST.246	PHOTO, OSHMANS, VEHICLE	35	35	42
7	ST.247	PHOTO, OSHMANS, VEHICLE	35	35	42
8	ST.248	DIAGRAM	35	35	42
9,	ST.249	DIAGRAM	35	35	42
0	ST.250	DIAGRAM	35	35	42
1	ST.251	DIAGRAM	35	35	42
2	ST.252	DIAGRAM	35	35	42
3	ST.253	DIAGRAM	35	35	42
4	ST.254	DIAGRAM	35	35	42
5	ST.255	DIAGRAM	35	35	42

1	ST.256	DIAGRAM	35	35	42
2	ST.257	DIAGRAM	35	35	42
3	ST.258	DIAGRAM	45	45	42
4	ST.2'59	DIAGRAM	86	86	42
5	ST.260	POSTER	86	86	42
6	ST.261	РНОТО	110	110	42
7	ST.262	РНОТО	110	110	42
. 8	ST.263	РНОТО	110	110	42
9	ST.264	РНОТО	110	110	42
10	ST.265	DRAWING	110	110	42
11	ST.266	PHOTO, RV PARK	110	110	42
12	ST.267	PHOTO, RV PARK	110	110	42
13	ST.268	РНОТО	120	120	42
14	ST.269	PHOTO, AERIAL OF COACHLIGHT AREA	120	120	42
15	ST.270	PHOTO, ARIEL	120	120	42
16	ST.271	PHOTO, AERIAL OF COACHLIGHT AREA	120	120	42
18	ST.272	PHOTO, RV PARK	120	120	42
19	ST.273	PHOTO, RV PARK	120	120	42
20	ST.274	PHOTO, VEHICLE	120	120	42
21	ST.275	PHOTO, RV PARK	120	120	42
22	ST.276	PHOTO, RV PARK	120	120	42
23	ST.277	PHOTO,RV PARK	120	120	42
24	ST.278	PHOTO,RV PARK	120	120	42
25	ST.279	PHOTO, RV PARK	120	120	42

	ALANA DI LA CALLA DI LA CALLA DEL CA	<u> </u>	·		
1	ST.280	PHOTO,RV PARK	120	120	42
2	ST.281	PHOTO, RV PARK	120	120	42
3	ST.282	DIAGRAM	120	120	42
	ST.284	RUGER PISTOL	143	143	42
. 4	ST.285	BERRETTA GUN	143	143	42
5	ST.286	WALLET	143	143	42
6	ST.287	POSTER OF GUNS	143	143	42
7	ST.288-A	HANDGUN	154	154	42
8	ST.289	HANDGUN	154	154	42
9	ST.290	HANDGUN	154	154	42
10	ST.291	HANDGUN	154	154	42
11	ST.292	HANDGUN	154	154	42
12	ST.293	HANDGUN	154	154	42
13	ST.294	HANDGUN	154	154	42
14	ST.295	HANDGUN	154	154	42
15	ST.296	HANDGUN	154	154	42
16	ST.297	HANDGUN	154	154	42
17	ST.298	HANDGUN	154	154	42
18	ST.299	HANDGUN	154	154	42
19	ST.300	HANDGUN	154	154	42
20	ST.301	HANDGUN	171	171	42
21	ST.302	HANDGUN	171	171	42
22	ST.303	HANDGUN	171	171	42
23	ST.304	HANDGUN	171	171	42
24	ST.305	HANDGUN	171	171	42
25					

2       ST.307       HANDGUN       171       171       4         3       ST.308       HANDGUN       171       171       4         4       ST.309       HANDGUN       171       171       4         5       ST.310       HANDGUN       171       171       4         6       ST.311       SHOTGUN       161       161       4         7       ST.312       RIFLE       161       161       4         8       ST.313       SHOTGUN       161       161       4         9       ST.314       RIFLE       161       161       4         10       ST.315       SHOTGUN       161       161       4         11       ST.316       SHOTGUN       161       161       4         12       ST.317       RIFLE       161       161       4         13       ST.318       RIFLE       161       161       4         14       ST.329       SHOTGUN       157       157       4         15       ST.320       HANDGUN       187       187       4         ST.324       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4      <					, .	
3 ST.308 HANDGUN 171 171 4 4 ST.309 HANDGUN 171 171 171 4 5 ST.310 HANDGUN 171 171 171 4 6 ST.311 SHOTGUN 161 161 161 4 7 ST.312 RIFLE 161 161 161 4 8 ST.313 SHOTGUN 161 161 161 4 9 ST.314 RIFLE 161 161 161 4 10 ST.315 SHOTGUN 161 161 161 4 11 ST.316 SHOTGUN 161 161 161 4 12 ST.317 RIFLE 161 161 161 4 13 ST.318 RIFLE 161 161 161 4 14 ST.319 SHOTGUN 157 157 4 15 ST.320 HANDGUN 157 157 4 16 ST.324 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4 16 ST.325 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4 17 ST.326 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4 18 ST.327 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4 19 ST.328 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4 19 ST.329 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4 19 ST.330 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4 19 ST.331 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4 19 ST.331 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4 19 ST.331 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4 19 ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4	,1	ST.306	HANDGUN	171	171	42
4 ST.309 HANDGUN 171 171 476 5 ST.310 HANDGUN 171 171 171 476 6 ST.311 SHOTGUN 161 161 477 7 ST.312 RIFLE 161 161 161 477 8 ST.313 SHOTGUN 161 161 161 477 9 ST.314 RIFLE 161 161 161 477 10 ST.315 SHOTGUN 161 161 161 477 11 ST.316 SHOTGUN 161 161 161 477 12 ST.317 RIFLE 161 161 161 477 13 ST.318 RIFLE 161 161 161 477 14 ST.319 SHOTGUN 157 157 477 15 ST.320 HANDGUN 157 157 477 15 ST.324 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 477 16 ST.325 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 477 17 ST.326 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 477 18 ST.327 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 477 19 ST.328 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 477 20 ST.329 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 477 21 ST.330 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 477 22 ST.331 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 477 23 ST.332 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 477 24 ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 477 25 ST.331 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 477 26 ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 477 27 ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 477 28 ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 477 29 ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 477 20 ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 477 20 ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 477 21 ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 477 22 ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 477 24 ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 477 25 ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 477 26 ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 477 27 ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 477 28 ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 477 29 ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 477 20 ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 477 20 ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 477 21 ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192	2	ST.307	HANDGUN	171	171	42
5       ST.310       HANDGUN       171       171       4         6       ST.311       SHOTGUN       161       161       4         7       ST.312       RIFLE       161       161       4         8       ST.313       SHOTGUN       161       161       4         9       ST.314       RIFLE       161       161       4         10       ST.315       SHOTGUN       161       161       4         11       ST.316       SHOTGUN       161       161       4         12       ST.317       RIFLE       161       161       4         13       ST.318       RIFLE       161       161       4         14       ST.319       SHOTGUN       157       157       4         15       ST.320       HANDGUN       187       187       4         ST.324       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4         ST.325       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4         ST.326       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4         ST.328       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4         ST.330	3	ST.308	HANDGUN	171	171	42
6 ST.311 SHOTGUN 161 161 4 7 ST.312 RIFLE 161 161 4 8 ST.313 SHOTGUN 161 161 4 10 ST.315 SHOTGUN 161 161 4 11 ST.316 SHOTGUN 161 161 4 12 ST.317 RIFLE 161 161 4 13 ST.318 RIFLE 161 161 4 14 ST.319 SHOTGUN 157 157 4 15 ST.320 HANDGUN 187 187 4 15 ST.324 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4 16 ST.325 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4 17 ST.326 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4 18 ST.327 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4 18 ST.328 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4 19 ST.329 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4 19 ST.329 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4 19 ST.330 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4 19 ST.331 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4 19 ST.331 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4 19 ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4	4	ST.309	HANDGUN	171	171	42
7 ST.312 RIFLE 161 161 4 8 ST.313 SHOTGUN 161 161 4 9 ST.314 RIFLE 161 161 4 10 ST.315 SHOTGUN 161 161 4 11 ST.316 SHOTGUN 161 161 4 12 ST.317 RIFLE 161 161 4 13 ST.318 RIFLE 161 161 4 14 ST.319 SHOTGUN 157 157 4 15 ST.320 HANDGUN 187 187 4 16 ST.324 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4 17 ST.326 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4 18 ST.327 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4 18 ST.328 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4 19 ST.329 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4 19 ST.329 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4 19 ST.330 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4 19 ST.331 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4 19 ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4 19 ST.331 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4 19 ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4	5	ST.310	HANDGUN	171	171	42
8 ST.313 SHOTGUN 161 161 4 9 ST.314 RIFLE 161 161 4 10 ST.315 SHOTGUN 161 161 4 11 ST.316 SHOTGUN 161 161 4 12 ST.317 RIFLE 161 161 4 13 ST.318 RIFLE 161 161 4 14 ST.319 SHOTGUN 157 157 4 15 ST.320 HANDGUN 187 187 4 15 ST.324 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4 16 ST.325 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4 17 ST.326 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4 18 ST.327 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4 19 ST.328 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4 19 ST.329 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4 19 ST.330 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4 19 ST.331 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4 19 ST.331 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4 19 ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4	6	ST.311	SHOTGUN	161	161	42
9 ST.314 RIFLE 161 161 4  10 ST.315 SHOTGUN 161 161 4  11 ST.316 SHOTGUN 161 161 4  12 ST.317 RIFLE 161 161 4  13 ST.318 RIFLE 161 161 4  14 ST.319 SHOTGUN 157 157 4  15 ST.320 HANDGUN 187 187 4  ST.324 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  16 ST.325 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  17 ST.326 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  18 ST.327 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  19 ST.328 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  20 ST.329 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  21 ST.330 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  22 ST.331 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  23 ST.332 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  24 ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  25 ST.334 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  27 ST.335 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  28 ST.331 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  29 ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  20 ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4	7	ST.312	RIFLE	161	161	42
10 ST.315 SHOTGUN 161 161 4  11 ST.316 SHOTGUN 161 161 4  12 ST.317 RIFLE 161 161 4  13 ST.318 RIFLE 161 161 4  14 ST.319 SHOTGUN 157 157 4  15 ST.320 HANDGUN 187 187 4  16 ST.324 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  17 ST.325 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  18 ST.326 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  18 ST.327 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  19 ST.328 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  20 ST.329 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  21 ST.330 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  22 ST.331 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  23 ST.332 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  24 ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  25 ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  26 ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  27 ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  28 ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4	8	ST.313	SHOTGUN	161	161	42
11 ST.316 SHOTGUN 161 161 4  12 ST.317 RIFLE 161 161 4  13 ST.318 RIFLE 161 161 4  14 ST.319 SHOTGUN 157 157 4  15 ST.320 HANDGUN 187 187 4  ST.324 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  16 ST.325 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  17 ST.326 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  18 ST.327 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  19 ST.328 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  20 ST.329 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  21 ST.330 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  22 ST.331 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  23 ST.332 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  24 ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4	9	ST.314	RIFLE	161	161	42
12       ST.317       RIFLE       161       161       4         13       ST.318       RIFLE       161       161       4         14       ST.319       SHOTGUN       157       157       4         15       ST.320       HANDGUN       187       187       4         ST.324       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4         16       ST.325       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4         17       ST.326       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4         18       ST.327       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4         19       ST.328       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4         20       ST.329       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4         21       ST.330       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4         22       ST.331       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4         23       ST.332       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4         24       ST.333       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4	10	ST.315	SHOTGUN	161	161	42
13 ST.318 RIFLE 161 161 4  14 ST.319 SHOTGUN 157 157 4  15 ST.320 HANDGUN 187 187 4  ST.324 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.325 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.326 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.327 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.328 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.329 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.330 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.331 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.332 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4	11	ST.316	SHOTGUN	161	161	42
14       ST.319       SHOTGUN       157       157       4         15       ST.320       HANDGUN       187       187       4         ST.324       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4         16       ST.325       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4         17       ST.326       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4         18       ST.327       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4         19       ST.328       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4         20       ST.329       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4         21       ST.330       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4         22       ST.331       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4         23       ST.332       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4         24       ST.333       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4	12	ST.317	RIFLE	161	161	42
15       ST.320       HANDGUN       187       187       4         ST.324       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4         16       ST.325       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4         ST.326       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4         18       ST.327       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4         19       ST.328       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4         20       ST.329       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4         21       ST.330       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4         21       ST.331       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4         22       ST.332       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4         23       ST.332       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4         24       ST.333       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4	13	ST.318	RIFLE	161	161	42
ST.324 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.325 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.326 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.327 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.328 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.329 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.330 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.331 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.332 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4	14	ST.319	SHOTGUN	157	157	42
16       ST.325       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4         17       ST.326       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4         18       ST.327       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4         19       ST.328       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4         20       ST.329       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4         21       ST.330       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4         22       ST.331       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4         23       ST.332       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4         24       ST.333       REVOLVER FRAMES       192       192       4	15	ST.320	HANDGUN	187	187	42
ST.325 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.326 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.327 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  19 ST.328 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  20 ST.329 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  21 ST.330 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  22 ST.331 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  23 ST.332 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4		ST.324	REVOLVER FRAMES	192	192	42
ST.326 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.327 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.328 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.329 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.330 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.331 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.332 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4	16	ST.325	REVOLVER FRAMES	192	192	42
ST.327 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.328 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.329 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.330 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  22 ST.331 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.332 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4	17	ST.326	REVOLVER FRAMES	192	192	42
ST.328 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.329 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.330 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  22 ST.331 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  23 ST.332 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4	18	ST.327	REVOLVER FRAMES	192	192	42
ST.329 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.330 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  22 ST.331 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  23 ST.332 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4	19	ST.328	REVOLVER FRAMES	192	192	42
ST.330 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.331 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.332 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4	20	ST.329	REVOLVER FRAMES	192	192	42
ST.331 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.332 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4  ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4	21	ST.330	REVOLVER FRAMES	192	192	42
ST.332 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4 ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4	22	ST.331	REVOLVER FRAMES	192	192	42
ST.333 REVOLVER FRAMES 192 192 4	23	ST.332	REVOLVER FRAMES	192	192	42
25		ST.333	REVOLVER FRAMES	192	192	42
and the control of th	25				<del></del>	

		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<del></del>		
	ст ээл	TEEM EDOM TEED	100	102 (DEG)	4.0
1	ST.334	ITEM FROM JEEP	182	183 (REC)	42
2	ST.335	RADIO	168	168	42
3	ST.336	RECEIPTS, RV	182	183 (REC)	42
4	ST.337	SCANNER	168	168	42
5	ST.338	SCANNER	182	183 (REC)	42
. 6	ST.339	WALKIE-TALKIE	168	168	42
7	ST.341	SMOKE GRENADE AND LIGHTER	168	168	42
8	ST.341-A	FREQUENCY GUIDE	166	166	42
	ST.341-B	ITEM FROM RV	168	168	42
10	ST.342	CAP	168	168	42
11 12	ST.342-A	SPEC WAR	78	78	48
13	ST.343-A	PURSE	80	81	46
14	ST.344	CONTENTS, TORN PICTURES	182 79	183 (REC) 79	42 46
15	*				
16	ST.344-A	SPEC WAR	78	78	48
17 18	ST.345	PKG.INSURANCE PAPERS	182 80	183 (REC) 80	42 46
	ST.346	BANDOLIER	167	167	42
19	ST.347	RADIO	168	168	42
20	ST.348	PAPERWORK, JEEP	177	183	42
21	ST.349	CLIPS, AMMO	177	183	42
22	ST.350	FANNY PACK	177	183	42
23	ST.351	PAPERWORK, JEEP	177	183	42
24	ST.352	HOLSTER	177	183	42
25	ST.353	HOLSTER, CLIP	177	183	42
26					

1	ST.354	ITEMS	177	183	42
2	ST.355	CLIPS, AMMO BACKPACK	177	183	42
3	ST.356	BAG OF AMMO	177	183	42
4	ST.358	CONTENTS OF PKG.	177	183	- 42
5	ST.359	HOLSTER	177	183	42
6	ST.359-A	NIGHT VISION SCOPE	177	183	42
7	ST.363	BANDOLIER	177	183	42
8	ST.364	PHOTO, RV	177	183	42
9	ST.364-A	РНОТО	177	183	42
10	ST.365	PHOTO - RV PARK	177	183	42
11	ST.365-A	РНОТО	177	183	42
12	ST.366	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	, <b>177</b>	183	42
13	ST.367	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
14	ST.368	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
15	ST.369	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
16	ST.370	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
17	ST.371	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
18	ST.372	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
19	ST.373	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
20	ST.374	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
21	ST.375	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
22	ST.376	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
23	ST.377	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
24	ST.378	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
25	ST.379	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
				• -	

283RD JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT 214/653-5863 NANCY BREWER, OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

and the second second				
ST.380	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.381	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.382	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.383	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.384	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.385	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.386	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.387	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.388	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.389	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.390	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.391	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.392	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.393	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.394	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.395	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.396	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.397	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.398	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.399	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.400	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.401	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.402	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.403	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.404	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
			-	- ' '

<u> </u>				
ST.405	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.406	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.407	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.408	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.409	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.410	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.411	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.412	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.413	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.414	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.415	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.416	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.417	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42 .
ST.418	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.419	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.420	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.421	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.422	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.423	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.424	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.425	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.426	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.427	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.428	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.429	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
			-	

ST.430	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.431	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.432	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.433	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.434	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.435	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.436	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.437	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.438	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.439	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.440	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.441	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.442	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.443	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.444	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.445	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.446	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.447	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.448	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.449	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.450	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.451	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.452	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.453	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
ST.454	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42

1		•				1
	ST.455	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42	
2	ST.456	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42	
3	ST.457	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42	
4	ST.458	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42	
5	ST.459	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42	
6	ST.460	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42	
7	ST.461	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42	
8	ST.462	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42	
9	ST.463	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42	l
10	ST.464	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42	ŀ
11	ST.465	POSTER	177 75	183 75	42 43	
13	ST.466	POSTER	177 75	183 · 75	42 43	
14 15	ST.467	POSTER	177 75	183 75	42 53	
16	ST.468	WALLET	177	183	42	ŀ
17	ST.469	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42	
18	ST.470	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42	
19	ST.471	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42	
20	ST.472	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42	
21	ST.473	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42	
22	ST.474	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42	
23	ST.475	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42	
24	ST.476	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42	
25	ST.477	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42	

	Marie Land Control of the Control of				
	ST.478	PHOTO, RV&EVIDENCE	177	183	42
1					42
2	ST.479	GRIPS	177	183	42
3	ST.480	CYLINDERS	177	183	42
4	ST.4'81	BAG	177	183	42
5	ST.483	FREQUENCY PAGE	177	183	42
6	ST.484	ENVELOPE	118	118	41
7	ST.484A-G	BULLET FRAGMENTS	118	118	41
8	ST.485	ENVELOPE	118	118	41
9	ST.485A-C	BULLET FRAGMENTS	118	118	41
10	ST.486	ENVELOPE	117	117	41
11	ST.486-A	PROJECTILES	117	117	41
12	ST.487	SMOKE GRENADE	119	119	41
13	ST.488	FRAGMENTS	114	114	41
14	ST.489	DIAGRAM	87	87	43
15	ST.490	РНОТО	9	9	42
16	ST.493	DNA REPORT	53	53	42
17	ST.495	POSTER, SERIAL NOS.	211	211	42
18	ST.496	PKG.BULLET ROUNDS	192	192	42
19	ST.498	RIVAS' PEN PACKET	14	14	45
20	ST.500	РНОТО	112	112	45
21	ST.501	РНОТО	112	112	45
22	ST.502	PHOTO	112	112	45
23	ST.503	PHOTO	112	112	45
24	ST.504	РНОТО	112	112	45
25	ST.505	РНОТО	112	112	45

1	ST.506	РНОТО	112	112	45
2	ST.507	РНОТО	112	112	45
3	ST.508	РНОТО	112	112	45
4	ST.509	PHOTO	112	112	45
5	ST.510	PHOTO	112	112	45
6	ST.511	PHOTO	112	112	45
7	ST.511-A	PHOTO	112	112	45
8	ST.512	РНОТО	112	112	45
9	ST.512-A	PHOTO	112	112	45
10	ST.513	РНОТО	112	112	45
11	ST.514	PHOTO	112	112	45
12	ST.515	РНОТО	112	112	45
13	ST.516	РНОТО	112	112	45
14	ST.517	РНОТО	112	112	45
15	ST.518	РНОТО	112	112	45
16	ST.519	РНОТО	112	112	45
17	ST.520	РНОТО	112	112	45
18	ST.521	РНОТО	112	112	45
19	ST.522	РНОТО	112	112	45
20	ST.523	РНОТО	112	112	45
21	ST.524	РНОТО	112	112	45
22	ST.525	РНОТО	112	/. <b>112</b>	45
23	ST.526	РНОТО	112	112	45
24	ST.529	РНОТО	112	112	45
25	ST.530	РНОТО	112	112	45
					:

		<u></u>			
1	ST.531	РНОТО	112	112	45
2	ST.532	PHOTO	112	112	45
3	ST.533	РНОТО	112	112	45
4	ST.534	РНОТО	112	112	. 45
5	ST.535	РНОТО	112	112	45
6	ST.536	РНОТО	112	112	45
7	ST.537	РНОТО	112	112	45
8	ST.538	РНОТО	112	112	45
9	ST.539	РНОТО	112	112	45
10	ST.540	РНОТО	112	112	45
11	ST.541	РНОТО	112	112	45
12	ST.542	РНОТО	112	112	45
13	ST.543	DIAGRAM	113	113	45
14	ST.544	DIAGRAM	113	113	45
15	ST.545	РНОТО	112	112	45
16	ST.547	РНОТО	112	112	45
17	ST.548	РНОТО	112	112	45
18	ST.549	РНОТО	112	112	45
19	ST.550	РНОТО	112	112	45
20	ST.551	PHOTO, PRISON	33	33	46
21	ST.552	PHOTO, PRISON	33	33	46
22	ST.553	PHOTO, PRISON	33	33	46
23	ST.554	PHOTO, PRISON	33	33	46
24	ST.555	PHOTO, PRISON	33	33	46
25	ST.556	PHOTO, PRISON	33	33	46

			,		
1	ST.557	PHOTO, PRISON	33	33	46
2	ST.558	PHOTO, PRISON	33	33	46
. 3	ST.559	PHOTO, PRISON	33	33	46
4	ST.560	PHOTO, PRISON	33	33	46
5	ST.561	PHOTO, PRISON	33	33	46
6	ST.562	PHOTO, PRISON	33	33	46
7	ST.563	PHOTO, PRISON	33	33	46
8	ST.564	PHOTO, PRISON	33	33	46
9	ST.565	PHOTO, PRISON	33	33	46
10	ST.566	PHOTO, PRISON	33	33	46
11	ST.567	PHOTO, PRISON	33	33	46
12	ST.582	POSTER	113	113	45
13	ST.607	PHOTO, AUTO ZONE	63	63	46
14	ST.608	PHOTO, AUTO ZONE	63	63	46
15	ST.609	PHOTO, AUTO ZONE	63	63	46
16	ST.610	PHOTO, AUTO ZONE	63	63	46
17	ST.611	PHOTO, AUTO ZONE	63	63	46
18	ST.612	РНОТО	83	83	46
19	ST.615	BALLISTIC VEST RECEIPT	182		42
20		RECEIPI	75	75	48
21	ST.755	POSTER OF MANAGERS	38	38	40
22	ST.756	TRANSCRIPT	123	123	40
23	ST.757	PHOTO-AUTOPSY	124	124 (REC)	40
24	ST.758	ENVELOPE	128	129	41
25	ST.758 A-C	SHELLS	128	129	41
				· -	

			s .		
. 1 2	ST.759	DIAGRAM	109	109	41
3	ST.760	PHOTO, EXPLORER	124	125	41
4	ST.761	PHOTO, EXPLORER	124	125	41
- 5	ST.762	PHOTO, EXPLORER	124	125	41
6	ST.763	PHOTO, PAVEMENT	124	125	41
7	ST.764	PHOTO, EXPLORER	124	125	41
8	ST.765	PHOTO, PAVEMENT	124	125	41
9	ST.766	PHOTO, EXPLORER	124	125	41
10	ST.767	PHOTO, EXPLORER	124	125	41
11	ST.768	PHOTO, EXPLORER	124	125	41
12	ST.769	PHOTO, EXPLORER	124	125	41
13	ST.770	PHOTO, EXPLORER	124	125	41
14	ST.771	PHOTO, EXPLORER	124	125	41
15	ST.772	РНОТО	93	93	42
16	ST.773	РНОТО	93	93.	42
17	ST.774	РНОТО	93	93	42
18	ST.775	РНОТО	93	93	42
19	ST.777	РНОТО	110	110	42
20	ST.778	РНОТО	110	110	42
21	ST.779	РНОТО	110	110	42
22	ST.780	РНОТО	110	110	42
23	ST.781	PHOTO, AERIAL	7	7	43
24	ST.782	PHOTO, AERIAL .	7	. <b>7</b> ,	43
25 <sup>°</sup>	ST.783	PHOTO, HOLIDAY INN	7	7	43
	ST.784	PHOTO, HOLIDAY INN	7	7	43
,				<del>-</del>	

283RD JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT 214/653-5863 NANCY BREWER, OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

1		1				
1		ROOM			*	
2	ST.785	PHOTO, HOLIDAY ROOM	INN	7	7	43
3 4	ST.786	PHOTO, HOLIDAY ROOM	INN	7	7	43
5 .	ST.787	PHOTO, HOLIDAY ROOM	INN	69	69	43
6	ST.788	PHOTO, HOLIDAY ROOM	INN	69	69	43
7 8	ST.789	PHOTO, HOLIDAY ROOM	INN	69	69	43
9	ST.790	PHOTO, HOLIDAY	INN	69	69	43
10	ST.791	PHOTO, HOLIDAY ROOM	INN	69	69	43
12	ST.792	PHOTO, HOLIDAY ROOM	INN	69	69	43
13 14	ST.793	PHOTO, HOLIDAY ROOM	INN	69	69	43
15	ST.794	PHOTO, HOLIDAY ROOM	INN	69	69	43
16 17	ST.795	PHOTO, HOLIDAY ROOM	INN	69	69	43
18	ST.796	PHOTO, HOLIDAY ROOM	INN	69	69	43
20	ST.797	PHOTO, HOLIDAY ROOM	INN	69	69	43
21	ST.798	PHOTO, HOLIDAY ROOM	INN	69	69	43
22	ST.799	PHOTO, HOLIDAY ROOM	INN	69	69	43
24	ST.800	PHOTO, HOLIDAY ROOM	INN	69	69	43
25						

1	ST.801	PHOTO, HOLIDAY INN ROOM	69	69	43	
3	ST.802	PHOTO, HOLIDAY INN ROOM	69	69	43	
4	ST.803	PHOTO, HOLIDAY INN ROOM	69	69	43	
6	ST.804	PHOTO, HOLIDAY INN ROOM	69	69	43	
7	ST.805	PHOTO, HOLIDAY INN ROOM	69	69	43	
8	ST.808	HANDGUN	69	69	43	
9	ST.810	HANDGUNS	69	79	43	
10	ST.811	HANDGUNS	69	69	43	
11	ST.812	HANDGUNS	69	69	43	
12	ST.813	HANDGUNS	69	69	43	
13	ST.814	HANDGUNS	69	69	43	
14	ST.815	HANDGUNS	69	69	43	
15	ST.817	HANDGUNS	69	69	43	
16	ST.818	HANDGUNS	69	69	43	
17	ST.819	SHOTGUN	76	76	43	
18	ST.820	SHOTGUN	76	76	43	
19	ST.822	POSTER - GUN INFO	75	75	43	
20	ST.824	PEN PACKET, NEWBURY	14	14	45	
21	ST.825	PEN PACKET, NEWBURY	14	14	45	
22	ST.826	PEN PACKET, NEWBURY	14	14	45	
23	ST.827	PEN PACKET, HALPRIN	14	14 .	45	
24	ST.828	PEN PACKET, RODRIGUEZ	14	14	45	
25			. <b>V</b>			

1	ST.829	PEN PACKET, GARCIA	14	14	45
2	ST.830	PEN PACKET, MURPHY	14	14	45
3	ST.846	BAG	193	193	42
4	ST.864	VIDEO TIMETABLE	71	71	41
. 5	ST.978	PRIOR ARREST VOLUNTARY STMT.	148	148	40
6	ST.979	MURPHY'S STMT.	24	24	45
7	ST.980	CASSETTE TAPE	84	84	38
8	ST.985	WALLET	183 151	183 (REC) 151 (ALL)	42 45
9	ST.986	WALLET	183 80	183 (REC) 80 (ALL)	42 46
11	ST.987	HAWKINS' GUN	82	82	43
12	ST.988	HAWKINS' GUN CLIP	82	82	43
13	ST.989	HAWKINS' HOLSTER	82	82	43
14	ST.990	PHOTO OF DIAGRAM	44	44	45
15	ST.991	PHOTO, GRIESER'S APARTMENT	44	44	45
16	ST.992	PHOTO, GRIESER'S APARTMENT	44	44	45
18	ST.993	PHOTO,GRIESER'S APARTMENT	44	44	45
20	ST.994	PHOTO, GRIESER'S APARTMENT	44	44	45
21	ST.995	PHOTO,GRIESER'S APARTMENT	44	44	45
22	ST.996	PHOTO, GRIESER'S APARTMENT .	44	44	45
24	ST.997	PHOTO,GRIESER'S APARTMENT	44	44	45
25				5 	

				a	
1	ST.998	PHOTO,GRIESER'S APARTMENT	44	44	45
3	ST.999	PHOTO, GRIESER'S APARTMENT	44	44	45
4	ST.1000	PHOTO, GRIESER'S APARTMENT	44	44	45
6	ST.1001	PHOTO, GRIESER'S APARTMENT	44	44	45
7	ST.1002	PHOTO,GRIESER'S APARTMENT	44	44	45
9	ST.1003	PHOTO, GRIESER'S APARTMENT	44	44	45
10	ST.1004	PHOTO, GRIESER'S APARTMENT	44	44	45
12	ST.1005	PHOTO, GRIESER'S APARTMENT	44	44	45
13 14	ST.1006	PHOTO, GRIESER'S APARTMENT	44	44	45
15	ST.1007	PHOTO, GRIESER'S APARTMENT	44	44	45
16 17	ST.1008	PHOTO, GRIESER'S APARTMENT	44	44	45
	ST.1009	DIAGRAM, APARTMENT	78	78	45
18	ST.1010	MURPHY'S LETTER	47	51	46
19	ST.1011	PKG.FOR LETTER	47	51	46
<b>2</b> 0	ST.1013	DNA REPORT	101	101	45
21	ST.1014	РНОТО	55	55	46
22	ST.1015	РНОТО	87	87	46
23	ST.1016	рното .	87	87	46
24	ST.1017	РНОТО	87	87	46
25					·

	The second second second		<u> </u>		
1	ST.1018	РНОТО	87	87	46
2	ST.1019	РНОТО	87	87	46
3	ST.1020	РНОТО	87	87	46
4	ST.1021	РНОТО	87	87	46
. 5	ST.1022	РНОТО	87	87	46
6	ST.1023	РНОТО	87	87	46
7	ST.1024	DNA REPORT	41	41	47
8	ST.1024	LETTER TO BECKA	30	30 (REC)	
9	ST.1025	LETTER TO BECKA	30		45
		•		30 (REC)	45
10	ST.1027	AERIAL PHOTO	46	46	45
11	ST.1028	AERIAL PHOTO	46	46	45
12	ST.1029	AERIAL PHOTO	46	46	45
13	ST.1030	EARPIECE	92	92	46
14	ST.1031	EARPIECE	92	92	46
15	ST.1032	COPY OF DIARY	63	63	47
16	ST.1033	РНОТО	51	51	47
17	ST.1034	РНОТО	51	51	47
18	ST.1035	РНОТО	51	51	47
19	ST.1036	РНОТО	51	51	47
20	ST.1037	РНОТО	51	51	47
21	ST.1038	РНОТО	51	51	47
22	ST.1039	РНОТО	51	51	47
23	ST.1040	РНОТО	51	51	47
24	ST.1041	РНОТО	51	51	47
25	ST.1042	РНОТО	51	51	47

			•		
1	ST.1043	РНОТО	51	51	47
2	ST.1044	РНОТО	51	51	47
. 3	ST.1045	РНОТО	51	51	47
4	ST.1'046	РНОТО	46	46	47
5	ST.1047	DIARY	58	58	47
6	ST.1048	LETTER	14	14	47
7	ST.1049	LETTER	14	14	47
8	ST.1050	ENVELOPE	14	14	47
9	ST.1051	ENVELOPE	14	14	47
10	ST.1053	RIVAS' STMT.EXCERPT	93	94	48
11	ST.1054	COURT JACKET, MURPHY	79	79	49
12	ST.1055	COURT JACKET, MURPHY	79	79	49
13	DX-1	PRISON VIDEO	127	127	47
14	DX-2	MURPHY'S TDC RECORD	140	140	47
15	DX-3	РНОТО	100	100	47
16	DX-4	РНОТО	90	90	47
17	DX-5	РНОТО	100	100	47
18	DX-6	PAIR OF GLASSES	98	98	48
19	DX - 7	DR. VIGEN'S CV	137	137	4.8
20	DX-8	EYE EXAM DOCUMENT	16	16	49
21				· .	
22					
23		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			

STATE OF TEXAS 1 COUNTY OF DALLAS 2 I, NANCY BREWER, Official Court Reporter for the 283rd 3 Judicial District Court, do hereby certify that the above 4 and foregoing constitutes a true and correct transcription 5 of all portions of evidence and other proceedings requested 6 in writing by counsel for the parties to be included in this volume of the Reporter's Record, in the above-styled and 8 numbered cause, all of which occurred in open court or in 9 chambers and were reported by me. 10 WITNESS MY OFFICIAL HAND on this the \_\_\_\_ day of 11 2004. 13 14 15 NANCY BREWER, CSR, NO. Expiration Date: 12-31-04 Official Reporter, 283rd JDC Frank Crowley Crts. Bldg. LB33 17 133 No. Industrial Blvd. Dallas, TX 75207 18 (214) 653 - 5863 19 20 21 22 23 25

LASER BOND FORM B PENGAD • 1-800-631-6989 • www.pengad.com

Case 3	09-cv-01368-L-BN Document 127-4	Filed 12/13/17	Page 55 of 669	Page#D 2888
1				
	APPE	ARANC	E S	
2	MR. WILLIAM HILL			
	SBOT NO.			
- 3	Dallas County District Attor MR. TOBY SHOOK	ney		*
4	SBOT No.			
<b>-</b>	MR. GEORGE WEST			•
5	SBOT No.			
	MR. RICK JACKSON			:
6	SBOT No.			
7	Assistant District Attorneys 133 N. Industrial Blvd.			
,	Dallas, Texas 75207			•
8	214-653-3700			
	Attorneys for State of Texas			
9 .	MD - MANNE HILDE			<del>-</del>
10	MR. WAYNE HUFF Attorney at Law			
10	SBOT NO.			
11	MR. KARO JOHNSON			
	Attorney at Law			
12	SBOT NO.			. •
13	MR. ADAM SEIDEL Attorney at Law			
	SBOT NO.			
14	MS. MICHELLE MOORE			
1 -	Attorney at Law			
15	SBOT NO.			
16	MR. KERRY YOUNG Chief Sta	ff Attorney	for the Dall	as
		iminal Cour		
17	OTHER CAUSE NOS. & APPEARANC	ES:		
18	F01-34004-T Donald Newbur	3.7 M	r. Kevin Broo	ls a
10	Pol-34004-1 Donald Newbul	. Y	r. Kevin bioo	KS .
19	F01-34006-T Michael A. Ro	driguez M	r. Jim Oatman	
20		M	r. Richard Ca	rrizales
21	F01-34007-T Joseph C. Gar	cia M	r. Paul Brauc	hle
2 1	101 3100 / 1 300 epil c. dal	CIG. II.	r. raar brauc	,
22	F01-34008-T Patrick Murph	y, Jr. M	s. Brook Busb	ee
		•		
23		M	r. Juan Sanch	ez
24	F01-34010-T Randy Ethan H	alprin M	r. George Ash	ford
	1.01 51010 1 Randy Bendin II	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	L. CCOLGC ABII	1014
25		M	r. Ed King	
			<del>,</del> ∓ •	

Case 3: 09-cv-01368-L-BN Document 127-4 Filed 12/13/17 Page 56 of 669 Page D 2889

LASER BOND FORM B 🏵 PENGAD • 1-800-631-6989

Exhibit No. Volume Description

(No exhibits)

3.

Case 3: 09-cv-01368-L-BN Document 127-4 Filed 12/13/17 Page 58 of 669 Page 12/13/17

EXHIBIT INDEX

Ident. Offer. Rec'd

### P R O C E E D I N G S

2

February 2, 2001

3

THE COURT: These are Cause Numbers

4

F01-34005-T, styled the State of Texas versus George Rivas.

5

F01-34004-T, styled the State of Texas versus Donald Keith

6

Newbury. F01-34007-T, styled the State of Texas versus Joseph

7

C. Garcia. F01-34008-T, styled the State of Texas versus

8

Patrick Henry Murphy, Jr. F01-34010-T, styled the State of

9

Texas versus Randy Ethan Halprin. F01-34006-T, styled the

10

State of Texas versus Michael Anthony Rodriguez.

11

I believe representing the State, I have here

12

today for purposes of the record, let's just put on, I have

13

District Attorney Bill Hill, Assistant District Attorney Toby

14

Shook, George West, Rick Jackson.

15

MR. HILL: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Representing the

16

17

defense, and let me just first state for the record that the

18

only -- the only one of the above six defendants that I

19

actually have in court today and is actually in Dallas County

20 21 at this point is Mr. George Rivas. The other five defendants are still in Colorado pending extradition hearings. They have

22

had attorneys that have been appointed here in Dallas County,

23

and I believe that each of the nonpresent defendants have

attorneys here today, at least one.

24

Let me go through the list and at least for

1	purposes of the record let me get each attorney to state
2	present if you're here. This is going to sound a little bit
3	like roll call, but since I need to know this for purposes of
4	the record who is here representing the interests of these
5	individuals, let's go ahead and do that.
6	For Mr. Rivas, I do have Mr. Wayne Huff present,
7	Mr. Karo Johnson, Mr. Adam Seidel and Ms. Michelle Moore is
8	assisting. Donald Keith Newbury, his appointed attorneys are
9	Doug Parks, who I believe is not here. Kevin Brooks.
10	MR. BROOKS: Present.
11	THE COURT: Co-counsel. Joseph Garcia, attorney
12	Hugh Lucas, who I believe is not here. Co-counsel, Paul
13	Brauchle.
14	MR. BRAUCHLE: Here.
15	THE COURT: Patrick Henry Murphy, Jr., lead
16	counsel Brook Busbee, who is here.
17	MS. BUSBEE: Yes.
18	THE COURT: And Juan Sanchez.
19	MR. SANCHEZ: Present.
20	THE COURT: Also here. Randy Ethan Halprin,
21	George Ashford, lead counsel.
22	MR. ASHFORD: Yes.
23	THE COURT: Co-counsel, Ed King.
24	MR. KING: Present, Your Honor.
25	THE COURT: Michael Anthony Rodriguez, Jim
	i e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e

Case 3: 09-cv-01368-L-BN Document 127-4 Filed 12/13/17 Page 60 of 669 Page 10 2893

25

#### Case 3:09-cv-01368-L-BN Document 127-4 Filed 12/13/17 Page 61 of 669 Page®D 2894 1 Oatman. 2 MR. OATMAN: Present. THE COURT: And Richard Carrizales. 3 MR. CARRIZALES: Present. 4 THE COURT: Okay. The chief staff attorney for 5 the Dallas County criminal court judges, Kerry Young, who is 6 also here, was asked to notify members of the media of my 7 intent to hold this hearing today and my intent to allow any 8 9 attorneys who are here representing various media agencies to make statements, should they choose to, remarks about my 10 concerns over pretrial publicity and the effect of this 11 pretrial publicity on my ability to impanel a fair and 12 impartial jury. Obviously, you have been asked to come today 13 14 to participate and, of course, to report anything that goes on here today. 15 Of the six defendants, let me just say, and 16 17. anybody who disagrees with my recollection of what has gone on 18 here up until this point, of the six defendants in this case, I believe five have made statements to the media regarding 19 20 certain levels of involvement in this particular case regarding 21 their beliefs as to their quilt or innocence and even statements regarding what should happen to them back in Dallas 22 23 County upon trial.

You are here today and have been asked to come today because I believe I have as a responsibility of the Judge

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

who is going to try these six cases to ensure that I am able to select a fair and impartial jury, and I believe we are going to begin, since I have Mr. Rivas here in Dallas County, we will begin jury selection as early as June in that particular case.

These juries that we impanel, these groups of people that we bring up to the courthouse to make decisions in these cases will, of course, be required to base their verdicts on what they hear in the courtroom and on the evidence they hear presented by the State and by the defense, should there be any. And of course, they will be required to disregard any and all pretrial remarks or pretrial recordings that they hear, including statements that are made by Mr. Rivas or purported to have been made by Mr. Rivas or Mr. Halprin -- I believe Mr. Halprin was on last night -- and will be required to disregard statements made by these individuals unless they are properly admitted during the trial. And in that regard, they can, of course, consider them for whatever purpose they choose. But they must be able to base their verdict on what they hear in the courtroom and not on extraditial (sic) unsworn statements made by participants of these trials.

The six defendants, of course, each of them has the right to come in on their trial date and enter pleas of not guilty. Regardless of what they have said to the media or purported to have said to a reporter about being guilty, they have the right to have a Dallas County jury base their verdict

on what is presented in the courtroom. They have the right if they are found guilty of capital murder then to have a jury decide what punishment is appropriate. And remarks that they make regarding what they feel is appropriate and should happen to them if they are found guilty are to be -- are to not be considered unless those remarks are introduced during the trial itself.

Over the past week, I believe I have even heard an expert witness testify that after hearing an audio recording of Mr. Rivas' voice, he could tell based on that audio recording whether or not Mr. Rivas was lying. And of course, I believe he said that he was. So these continued reports, of course, affect the people that listen to them in Dallas County, and I am concerned about the 72 people who are ultimately going to be making the decision in each of these six cases, concerned about their ability to base their verdict on what they hear in the courtroom and not on what they hear reported in the news.

Now, let me make it very clear that if I do impose an order restricting publicity on behalf of the participants in each of these six cases, and that will include, of course, attorneys, witnesses, potential witnesses, any representatives of either side, investigators, co-counsel, of course. Any other experts that are employed by either side, they will fall under this rule. But my order will be directed to them, not to the news media. So this is directed to the

Case 3	:09-cv-01368-L-BN Document 127-4 Filed 12/13/17 Page 64 of 669 Page 11 2897
1	trial participants and will include the five defendants who are
2	still in Colorado and any remarks that they may say.
3	Okay. I would be glad to hear anything from
4	anybody here who is an attorney who has something they would
5	like to say regarding my intent to make these restrictions.
6	Any remarks from the State?
7	MR. HILL: Your Honor, we have no objections to
8	your proposed order.
9	THE COURT: Defense? Any defendant? Mr. Huff,
10	let's start with you.
11	MR. HUFF: We have no remarks, Your Honor.
12	THE COURT: All right. Mr. Brooks for Donald
13	Keith Newbury.
14	MR. BROOKS: No objection, Your Honor.
15	THE COURT: All right. Mr. Brauchle for Joseph
16	Garcia.
17	MR. BRAUCHLE: We have no objection, Your Honor.
18	THE COURT: Ms. Busbee for Patrick Murphy.
19	MS. BUSBEE: No objection, Your Honor.
20	THE COURT: Mr. Ashford for Randy Ethan Halprin.
21	MR. ASHFORD: No objections, Your Honor.
22	THE COURT: All right. Michael Anthony
23	Rodriguez, Jim Oatman.
24	MR. OATMAN: No objection, Your Honor.
25	THE COURT: Okay. State, defense, members of

21

22

23

24

25

### Case 3: D9-cv-01368-L-BN Document 127-4 Filed 12/13/17 Page 65 of 669 Page 12/2898 the media, anybody like to say anything? This is your chance. 1 2 MS. DEBRA THOMAS: Your Honor, I am Debra Thomas from Hayhes & Boone. 3 THE COURT: Yes, ma'am. 4 MS. DEBRA THOMAS: I represent the Fort Worth 5 6 Star Telegram. While we are sensitive to the Court's concerns 7 about a fair and impartial jury, we are also sensitive to the first amendment and the Texas constitutional rights afforded 8 the defendants in this matter, and we would request the 9 10 opportunity to brief the Court on our views of the law in this 11 matter in this regard and would appreciate any opportunity to 12 address our objections and concerns with the Court. 13 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much. Anybody else? A lot of people looking down all of a sudden. Come on, 14 this is your chance. 15 16 Is that it? Anybody else have anything they 17 want to say? All right. As it relates to -- as it relates to briefings and any authority you would like me to look at, I 18 would be glad to consider that. However, I am going to find at 19

this point that any further extrajudicial statements made by the trial participants on both sides are reasonably likely to. prejudice the proceedings in this court.

I find that there is a clear or serious threat to the fairness of the trial. I find that less restrictive alternatives are not adequate to mitigate the harm caused by

the threatened danger.

17.

I am issuing this order restricting parties, attorneys and witnesses from making any further extrajudicial statements or furnishing any information to members of the media that might reasonably be expected to pose a serious threat to the constitutional guarantees of a fair trial or

impair the Court's ability to impanel an impartial jury.

the publicity, and that this order would effectively prevent

Let me say for the purposes of the record that a witness is someone who has been sworn in by the Court or anyone that an attorney for the State or the defense believes in good faith has information material to the trial of these cases and the person has been notified of that fact and of the existence of this order.

Any witness or potential witness shall be notified of this order whether they be in Texas, Colorado or elsewhere. I find that these restrictions on pretrial publicity are necessary to preserve the availability of the option of change of venue, and there is no indication that delaying the trial of this case or the other five defendants would lessen the amount of pretrial publicity in these cases.

I do not restrict the publication or broadcasting by members of the press or news media any information not prohibited by law. This order does not prohibit access by the media to public records or documents. A witness, prospective

# Case 3: 09-cv-01368-L-BN Document 127-4 Filed 12/13/17 Page 67 of 669 Page 14 2900 witness, defendant, law enforcement officer, attorney or other 1 person subject to this order is not prohibited by this order 2 3 from making out of court statements, reciting without comment information contained in public records, scheduling or the 4 result of any hearing or the general nature of the proceedings. 5 6 Obviously, I am equally concerned about free 7 speech but believe that when you have free speech rights and the right to a fair trial that conflict, that the right to a 8 fair trial is going to prevail. I will issue an order this 9 10 I will be glad to revisit the issue any time I am afternoon. presented any authority to review, and you never know, may 11 12 change my mind. I will also issue findings in this regard. Thank y'all very much. 13 14 Sheriff, he can go back. 15 (End of proceedings) 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

Case 3:	09-cv-01368-L-BN Document 127-4 Filed 12/13/17 Page 68 of 669 Page 15 2901
1	STATE OF TEXAS )
2	COUNTY OF DALLAS )
3	I, SHARON HAZLEWOOD, deputy court reporter in
4	and for the 283rd Judicial District Court of Dallas County,
5 ·	State of Texas, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing
6	contains a true and correct transcription of all portions of
7	evidence and other proceedings requested in writing by counsel
8	for the parties to be included in the reporter's record in the
9	above styled and numbered cause, all of which occurred in open
10	court or in chambers and were reported by me.
11	I further certify that this transcription of the
12	proceedings truly and correctly reflects the exhibits, if any,
13	offered by the respective parties.
14	I further certify that Dallas County did not pay
15	a substitute court reporter while I prepared this transcript.
16	WITNESS my hand, the 24th day of July, 2003.
17	Shanon Hazlewood
18	SHARON HAZLEWOOD, C.S.R.
19	Certification Number: 628
20	Date of Expiration: 12-31-2004
21	283RD JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
22	Frank Crowley Courts Building
23	133 N. Industrial, LB33
24	Dallas, Texas 75207-4313
25	214/653-5674

			REPORTER'S	RECORD
			VOLUME 3	OF (a)
•			VOLIONE	$\circ_{\Gamma}$

ORIGINAL

FEBRUARY 23, 2001

Court Trial Cause Number F01-34008-T

(later filed as F01-00328-T)

6 THE STATE OF TEXAS

IN THE 283RD JUDICIAL

l vs.

1

2

3

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

DISTRICT COURT OF

PATRICK MURPHY, JR.

DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS

OTHER CAUSE NUMBERS AND DEFENDANTS:

F01-34004-T (later refiled as F01-00323-T) George Rivas

F01-34004-T (later refiled as F01-00324-T) Donald Newbury

F01-34006-T (later refiled as F01-00326-T) Michael Rodriquez

F01-34008-T (later refiled as F01-00328-T) Patrick Murphy, Jr.

F01-34007-T (later refiled as F01-00325-T) Joseph Garcia

F01-34010-T (later refiled as F01-00327-T) Randy Halprin

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

FILED IN

(APPEARANCES ON FOLLOWING PAGE)

Troy C. Bennett, Jr., Clerk

MAR 9 - 2004

On the 23rd day of February, 2001, the above entitled and numbered cause came on to be heard in the said .

Court, Honorable Molly Francis, Judge Presiding, and the following proceedings were held, to-wit:

24

Case 3 09-cv-01368-L-BN Document 127-4 Filed 12/13/17 Page 70 of 669 Page 2903

APPEARANCES

1

2

MR. TOBY SHOOK

SBOT No. 18293250

Case 3 09-cv-01368-L-BN Document 127-4 Filed 12/13/17 Page 71 of 669 PageID 2904

Volume

CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX

Witness

Case 3:09-cv-01368-L-BN Document 127-4 Filed 12/13/17 Page 72 of 669 Page#D 2905

ALPHABETICAL INDEX

. 1

Case 3	:09-cv-01368-L-BN Document 127-4 Filed 12/13/17 Page 73 of 669 PageID 2906
1	EXHIBIT INDEX
2	Exhibit Number Volume Description Ident Offered Rec'd
3	(No exhibits) 4
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
. [	SHARON HAZLEWOOD, CSR (214) 653-5888

# 

# 

#### PROCEEDINGS

February 23, 2001

THE COURT: This is Cause Number F01-34005-T, styled the State of Texas versus George Rivas, is the number we are going to put this under, even though my order applies in all six cases. I have before me Debra Thomas, who was here previously, and -- Mr. Williams, I'm sorry, I didn't write down your first name.

MR. WILLIAMS: Tom, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Tom Williams from Fort Worth. We have -- I have a copy of your motion and your authority, and will be glad for you to argue from that motion or present anything additional you would like to. Go right ahead.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Your Honor.

Your Honor, I would have some argument and I appreciate the opportunity the Court has given us to file this and to come before you. And what I would like to do this afternoon is ask the Court to look at what it did on February 2nd and perhaps re-evaluate some of these issues, or at least reconsider some of these issues. And as the Court does so, I would ask that the Court do so in the context of trying to , analyze what is it that we are concerned might happen going forward that this order will do anything about.

The publicity that has already occurred, Your Honor, has occurred. And what happened and what was reported

25

#### before this matter came within your jurisdiction is done, and, 1 obviously, the Court has no power to do anything about that. 2 There is going to be publicity going forward, as there always 3 4 is in cases like this. And some of the types of publicity that the transcript of the February 2nd hearing at least indicated 5 you were concerned about, I think will happen regardless. 6 example about the so-called expert on lie detection who goes on 7 8 the radio talk shows and says, well, I can tell they're all lying, an understandable concern that the Court has --9 10 THE COURT: My jury is watching that. 11 MR. WILLIAMS: Sure. Sure. But we really can't do anything about that. And the -- I think -- what I wanted to 12 raise to your attention in the motion and to elaborate on a 13 14 little bit today is that it seems to me that an order such as this in these kinds of cases really just deny the public access 15 16 to a source of information that people might actually know what they're talking about and might have reliable and credible 17 18 information that isn't going to interfere with the ability 19 to --20 THE COURT: Are you talking about anybody or are you talking specifically about the six defendants? 21 22 MR. WILLIAMS: Well, Your Honor if I could, as 23 your order did, I am going to kind of break it down into

Case 3:09-cv-01368-L-BN Document 127-4 Filed 12/13/17 Page 75 of 669 Page D 2908

THE COURT:

That is fine.

different categories --

### MR. WILLIAMS: -- of players. 1 It is hard for me not to jump in 2 THE COURT: sometimes, and I will try not to. 3 MR. WILLIAMS: I understand. I understand. 4 Ι 5 appreciate it. But what you did in your order, it seems to me, 6 7 is you said there is -- the defendants, the six, because I understand you to say and I read your order that it would apply 8 to all of them. 9 10 THE COURT: Yes, sir. 11 MR. WILLIAMS: And then you've got the attorneys, and then you've got what I call kind of everybody 12 13 else, the nonlawyer, nondefendant participants. On the attorneys, as I read your order, all you really told them to do 14 15 is follow the disciplinary rules, which I am sure they are going to do anyway. So I really would focus this afternoon on 16 17 the other two categories. On the defendants, at least some of whom have 18 19 had some things to say --20 THE COURT: Five of six have. 21 MR. WILLIAMS: Sure. That's right. 22 It seems to me, Your Honor, that with respect to those defendants who are now represented by competent counsel 23 who will presumably advise them of the advisability of anything 24 25 they do. If those defendants wish to speak out and if they are

Case 3 09-cv-01368-L-BN Document 127-4 Filed 12/13/17 Page 76 of 669 Page D 2909

Oudo C	age of elege E bit Becament 121 1 1 mod 12/16/17 1 age 17 of elege 1 age 18 2010
1	going to if they want to be a willing speaker, then there is
2	no reason the Court should inhibit that.
3	THE COURT: Except that they have the right
4	I'm sorry, I can't help myself.
5	MR. WILLIAMS: That is okay.
6	THE COURT: Except they have the right to come
7	in here and plead not guilty on the day of trial.
8	MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, they do.
9	THE COURT: If up until that point every day
10	they have said on every single news station and to every print
11	reporter I am guilty
12	MR. WILLIAMS: That
13	THE COURT: and then I have to bring these
14	people in and say you have to presume them innocent, and they
15	say, but I just saw in the Fort Worth Star Telegram, they gave
16	this big long interview and said they were as guilty as can be
17	and thought they ought to be given the death penalty. It just
18	makes it very difficult, would you not agree, for me to be able
19	to get 12 people six times, if this continues up until the day
20	before trial?
21	I am going to quit here in a minute.
22	MR. WILLIAMS: No, no. That
23	THE COURT: If it continues up until the day
24	before trial, it is going to be a very difficult thing for me
25	to get 12 fair and impartial people who can put agide what

Case 3	109-cv-01368-L-BN Document 127-4 Filed 12/13/17 Page 78 01 669 Page19 2911
1	these what continues to be reported and base their verdict
2	on what they hear in the courtroom.
3	MR. WILLIAMS: Your Honor, I have two responses
4	to that.
5	THE COURT: Okay.
6	MR. WILLIAMS: One is more the first I will
7	give you is more general in nature, and the second will relate
8 ,,	to this specific order.
9	THE COURT: Okay.
10	MR. WILLIAMS: As to the more general comment,
11	in this day and age I think the ability to get the jury is
12	easier perhaps than it once was, particularly in a metropolitan
13	county such as this. We have got a large pool of potential
14	jurors. And we are exposed to all kinds of information about
15	all sorts of things.
16	And as time goes on, I understand this case
17	probably, at best, won't be tried until the summer, news value
18	diminishes, people's interest diminishes, other news events
19	comes into play, we start talking presidential pardons or
20	bombing Iraq or, you know, whatever it is we are talking about.
21	And I think with careful voir dire and careful instructions,
22	which I know you will do, it can be done.
23	And we have seen other cases, not just in
24	Dallas, but Houston, Fort Worth, Austin, where there has been a

high volume of publicity. And some of the cases we cited in

### the brief talk about that, that a large volume of publicity in 1 2 and of itself does not necessarily inhibit the ability to get a 3 fair trial. The other -- that is the more general comment. 4 The specific on this order, and this is 5 something that will relate to the second category as well, the 6 7 nonlawyer, nondefendant category, is you gave the example of what happens if one of the defendants goes on TV or talks to 8 9 newspaper every day and says, I did it, I did it, I did it. 10 You know, you're assuming that is what he's going to to say. 11 THE COURT: Which some have. 12 MR. WILLIAMS: And I think -- but what I think your order potentially does, Your Honor, is it prohibits them 13 14 from saying anything because the defendant and his 15 representatives are ordered not to say anything which could 16 reasonably be expected to be disseminated if it may reasonably 17 be expected to pose a serious threat to the constitutional guarantee to a fair trial. And you use very similar language 18 on that category of nonlawyer participants and witnesses. 19 20 And so I think by imposing upon someone who might otherwise choose to speak, that standard, I cannot speak 21 out if it could reasonably be expected to pose a serious threat 22 to the constitutional guarantee to a fair trial, I think --23 24 THE COURT: Does that seem unfair? I think people are going to err 25 MR. WILLIAMS:

Case 3 09-cv-01368-L-BN Document 127-4 Filed 12/13/17 Page 79 of 669 Page 2912

#### Case 3:09-cv-01368-L-BN Document 127-4 Filed 12/13/17 Page 80 of 669 Page 12/13/13 on the side of caution, if they want to obey your order, and 1 they're not going to say anything. And I think that is the net 2 3 effect of using language like that. That is even stricter language than we impose on the lawyers under the disciplinary 4 5 rules. The lawyers and the defendants and 6 THE COURT: 7 anybody else can tell you what is going on in the case, what is going to happen when, about settings --8 MR. WILLIAMS: That's true. 9 THE COURT: -- about any procedural matters they 10 11 want to talk about, they can talk about. 12 MR. WILLIAMS: Right, I agree with that. 13 about all that is, is -- I can tell you what I can also go find 14 out in the district clerk's jacket, too, and that's fine. 15 is --16 THE COURT: Well, not necessarily. MR. WILLIAMS: 17 That is public and you made clear 18 that you're not restricting that, and I think that is as it And I did not gather from the order or the 19 transcript of the 2nd that you were concerned about that. 2.0 But my concern about your order using words like 21 22 may reasonably be expected to pose a serious threat to the constitutional guarantee of a fair trial, if I want to be safe 23 I better just not say anything, it seems to me, if I am a 24

person who potentially --

# Case 3 09-cv-01368-L-BN Document 127-4 Filed 12/13/17 Page 81 of 669 Page 2914 THE COURT: They could come ask me what I 1 2 think --MR. WILLIAMS: 3 True. THE COURT: -- if I think what they intend to 5 say is or is not. MR. WILLIAMS: True, they could. I think that 6 7 imposes a very serious constitutional issue if I have to come 8 seek the permission of government before I want to do that. 9 And I think that is the concern. So -- and to make the comparison to the rules 10 that the lawyers must abide by, what Rule 307 says, and which 11 you incorporated in your order, is that a lawyer should not say 12 13 anything that will have a substantial likelihood of materially threatening the ability to get a fair trial. And it seems to 14 me you've got an even stricter standard on these nonlawyers, 15 16 particularly the witnesses. The defendants have their own 17 counsel, and that seems to be a little bit different. But for a nonlawyer who might be a witness, 18 might be involved in law enforcement, might have some 19 connection to the case, to try to have to make that judgment, 20 what -- if I say this, is it -- is there a reasonable 21. expectation this will pose a serious threat, I think the net 22 effect is that these people won't say anything at all. 23 As far as defendants themselves --24 THE COURT: But you will agree that is not what 25

# Case 3 09-cv-01368-L-BN Document 127-4 Filed 12/13/17 Page 82 of 669 Page 2915 I am telling them to do? If they are overly cautious and law abiding and their choice is to not say anything at all, then that is their choice. 4 MR. WILLIAMS: Except that if I make that choice because I am concerned that if I guess wrong and you disagree 5 with me and then I am at risk of being in contempt of court, 6 then it really isn't my choice. 7 8 THE COURT: I appreciate that. MR. WILLIAMS: The other comment I just want to 9 make about the defendants, Your Honor, is, of course, 10 obviously, constitutional rights can be waived. And to the 11 12 extent that the defendants' own statements might create an issue, assuming the statement was given knowingly, and it seems 13 14 to me there is less of a concern for the Court. 15 THE COURT: That their constitutional right to a 16 fair trial could be waived? I'm sorry, I don't understand. 17 This is more something I see as my issue. 18 MR. WILLIAMS: And I agree. The Court does have 19 that responsibility independently. I do agree with that. 20 THE COURT: Okay. MR. WILLIAMS: But it does seem to me that to, 21 the extent a defendant -- whether it is this case or any other 22 23 case, to the extent a defendant chooses to grant a press interview and some adverse consequence flows from that 24

decision, it seems to me the defendant has kind of accepted

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
1
       that risk himself.
 2
                      THE COURT: Except that I still have to pick a
       jury that can follow the law, regardless of what consequence
 3
       they receive.
                      MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, you do, and your --
 5
                      THE COURT: My concerns may be more selfish, Mr.
 6
 7
       Williams, and that is at least for the system and the fairness
 8
       of the system because every one of these defendants are
       entitled to a fair trial, and I am doing the best I can to see
 9
       that they get one. But anyway, I'm sorry, keep going.
10
11
                      MR. WILLIAMS: Well, I understand the Court's
      point, but I am confident that when it comes time to pick the
12
       jury you will have the process in place to determine if that
13
      has been a problem, and to the extent certain people may have
14
      been affected by something they heard, then that is what voir
15
16
      dire is for.
17
18
```

Case 3:09-cv-01368-L-BN Document 127-4 Filed 12/13/17 Page 83 of 669 Page 5 2916

The other thing, Your Honor, I would ask you to think about this afternoon is not so much a constitutional issue, not whether you have the power to issue some sort of an order. I do think as this one is written it is broader than courts have upheld, but also to step back, as I said a moment, ago, and evaluate should we enter this order. And in that context, think about what is it that might happen in the future going forward that this is intended to capture.

And I don't know that I know what it is, and I

23

24

25

# regrettably was not here on February 2nd. I have read the 1 2 transcript of the hearing. The things that I saw the Court expressed concern about in that transcript, it seems to me, 3 this order doesn't affect. And so what we are doing is denying 4 5 the press, and then ultimately the public, access to a source of information, of people who might have reliable information 6 7 to give out. 8 THE COURT: Okay. That's it? Is that it? 9 MR. WILLIAMS: Well, I will be happy to 10 entertain any more questions the Court has. I would urge, as we said --11 THE COURT: Would you let me just ask you this? 12 13 MR. WILLIAMS: Yes. 14 THE COURT: Would you not agree that the media 15 access to six defendants or five out of the six, access 16 probably to all six, this one chose not to talk, has been 17 unprecedented? When ever has a criminal defendant over and 18 over given interviews repeatedly about their guilt or innocence 19 in a case and motives and what went on, et cetera, et cetera? 20 A whole fact -- it doesn't happen. It doesn't happen. before trial. 21

Case 3:09-cv-01368-L-BN Document 127-4 Filed 12/13/17 Page 84 of 669 Page 6 2917

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, we certainly have precedent of defendants giving interviews. Now, quite often they're saying I didn't do it and proclaiming their innocence. But, you know, you asked me if it is unprecedented --

out.

# 1 THE COURT: Media access already --2 MR. WILLIAMS: I am mentally thinking for some 3 examples, Your Honor. I don't think the notion of accused citizens talking to the press before trial is all that unusual. 4 Now, maybe what is said in a given case may vary, but we have 5 6 got plenty of examples out there where defendants, you know, 7 upon an initial --8 THE COURT: You may see more criminal cases than I do, but I believe this is the -- media access has already 9 been --10 (Ms. Thomas shaking her head) 11 12 THE COURT: Don't shake your head, please, ma'am. 13 14 MR. WILLIAMS: Your Honor, cases with political overtones, we see defendants talking all the time and we manage 15 to pick a jury. I don't think it is unprecedented. Perhaps it 16 17 is not common, but that is because most criminal cases don't -are not the type of case that draw attention in the first 18 19 place. By definition, 95 percent of the cases we try 20 21 down here do not attract publicity. There is nothing that especially noteworthy about them. So the pool of cases in 22 which there may even be any media coverage is a small pool. 23 But I don't find it terribly unusual that a defendant may speak 24

Case 3 09-cv-01368-L-BN Document 127-4 Filed 12/13/17 Page 85 of 669 Page D 2918

remarks?

# Case 3 09-cv-01368-L-BN Document 127-4 Filed 12/13/17 Page 86 of 669 Pagel 2919 Now, perhaps what has been said here might not 1 2 be common. THE COURT: I think the third defendant in the 3 James Byrd trial gave an interview before trial. 4 MR. WILLIAMS: That is true, yes. 60 Minutes. 5 THE COURT: Uh-huh. 7 MR. WILLIAMS: And that is a good example. 8 know, what he wanted to say in that interview was not 9 inculpatory. He was trying to say I didn't have quite as much to do with it as those other two guys. 10 11 THE COURT: Absolutely. Okay. 12 MR. WILLIAMS: I think the other thing, Your Honor, and I alluded to this a little bit in the papers. 13 of what some of these defendants have been reported to say in 14 the press I think goes beyond just guilt or innocence in this 15 case and rises to the level of what I call an agreed political 16 speech. If I want to speak out on the failings of the criminal 17 18 justice system or speak out on the failings of the Texas prison system, and, you know, somehow or another that led to something 19 that happened, that, it seems to me, does not really go to the 20 21 guilt or innocence of the accused in this case, but that is . captured by your order and it would seem to me they could not 22 do that under this order. 23 24 THE COURT: Okay. Anything else? Mr. Shook,

Case 3	09-cv-01368-L-BN Document 127-4 Filed 12/13/17 Page 87 of 669 Pagକ୍ରାରୁ 2920
1	MR. SHOOK: Nothing from the State, Judge.
2	THE COURT: Mr. Johnson?
3	MR. JOHNSON: We have no comment, Your Honor.
4	THE COURT: Mr. Jackson, would you like to say
5	anything?
6	MR. JACKSON: No, ma'am. Thank you for
7	offering, though.
8	THE COURT: Mr. Brauchle, comments? I think
9	everyone should have
. 10	MR. BRAUCHLE: I will decline, Your Honor.
11	THE COURT: All right. I am going to deny the
12	request to vacate my restrictions regarding publicity.
13	Thank you both for coming over to Dallas today.
14	All right.
15	(End of proceedings)
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Case 3:	09-cv-01368-L-BN Document 127-4 Filed 12/13/17 Page 88 of 669 Page 20 2921
1	STATE OF TEXAS )
2	COUNTY OF DALLAS )
3	I, SHARON HAZLEWOOD, deputy court reporter in and for
4	the 283rd Judicial District Court of Dallas County, State of
5	Texas, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing contains
6	a true and correct transcription of all portions of evidence
7	and other proceedings requested in writing by counsel for the
8	parties to be included in the reporter's record in the above
9 ·	styled and numbered cause, all of which occurred in open court
10	or in chambers and were reported by me.
11	I further certify that this transcription of the
12	proceedings truly and correctly reflects the exhibits, if any,
13	offered by the respective parties.
14	I further certify that Dallas County did not pay a
15	substitute court reporter while I prepared this transcript.
16	WITNESS my hand, the 15th day of July, 2003.
17	Shanon Magleubod
18	SHARON HAZLEWOOD, C.S.R.
19	Certification Number: 628
20	Date of Expiration: 12-31-2004
21	283RD JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
22	Frank Crowley Courts Building
23	133 N. Industrial, LB33
24	Dallas, Texas 75207-4313
25	214/653-5674

Case 3:09-cv-01368-L-BN Document 127-4 Filed 12/13/17 Page 90 of 669 PageID 2923

ATTORNEYS FOR THE STATE OF TEXAS

APPEARANCES

1

2

# Case 3:09-cv-01368-L-BN Document 127-4 Filed 12/13/17 Page 95 of 669 PageID 2928 PROCEEDINGS 1 2 February 27, 2001 3 THE COURT: These are Cause Nos. F01-00324, 4 F02-00328-T, styled the State of Texas versus Donald Keith Newbury who is here with his attorney, Doug Parks. Co-counsel 5 Kevin Brooks. 6 7 Patrick Henry Murphy, Jr., who is here with his 8 attorney Brook Busbee. Co-counsel Juan Sanchez. 9 Here today just to go over a couple of matters that I thought I would bring Mr. Murphy and Newbury out to make 10 sure that they had gotten information from their attorneys. 11 12 And Ms. Busbee, you and Mr. Parks tell me you all have discussed the restrictions regarding publicity that I 13 14 entered in the State of Texas versus George Rivas. 15 You have gotten copies of my order regarding publicity regarding what your clients are allowed to talk to 16 the media about or anyone else about. You-all have gone over 17 18 those orders. Everybody understands those orders. 19 I imagine my orders are probably more lenient than your own instructions to your clients. I don't know. 20 might be wrong. But everybody is aware of those and has gotten 21 Anything we need to talk about any more as it relates 22 23 to that? 24 MR. PARKS: Nothing from us, Your Honor.

Ms. Busbee, anything else?

THE COURT:

1	MS. BUSBEE: No.
2	THE COURT: I have before me in Mr. Murphy's
3	case an order asking that I appoint an investigator. Ms.
4	Busbee, I have granted that order.
,5	I have in Mr. Newbury's case a motion to
6	photograph the defendant that has been filed by the State.
7	Anything else the State wants to say in that regard?
8	MR. SHOOK: I think the motion speaks for
9	itself, Judge. It goes to some tatoos viewed by witnesses
10	there at the Oshman's but also his identification. Obviously,
11	TDC keeps tracks of inmates' tatoos, and it is one of their
12	identifiers. So we think it is relevant to identification.
13	THE COURT: And it is your intent to take those
14	photographs today?
15	MR. SHOOK: Right now.
16	THE COURT: Yes. Mr. Parks, response?
17	MR. PARKS; Your Honor, we would object to the
18	State taking those photographs for two reasons. One, we don't
19	believe they are, in fact, probative of any matter of fact to
20	be determined in this case. They're not relevant under Rule
21	401.
22	The motion indicates that some of the witnesses
23	may have observed some tatoos, doesn't indicate where on Mr.
24	Newbury's body those tatoos were observed. Certainly tatoos on

Case 3 09-cv-01368-L-BN Document 127-4 Filed 12/13/17 Page 96 of 669 PageID 2929

the chest, stomach, back probably would not have been observed

# Case 3:09-cv-01368-L-BN Document 127-4 Filed 12/13/17 Page 97 of 669 PageID 2930

by any witnesses, so we would object to those.

And with respect to the identifier portion of Mr. Shook's motion, I certainly, while tatoos can be useful as identifiers, fingerprints, I believe, are generally considered to be the best use of identifiers.

And certainly I don't think there is any serious question that Mr. Newbury is, in fact, Mr. Newbury, and we would object to the photographs.

THE COURT: Objection overruled. Motion to photograph the defendant granted. That will be done today in the holdover.

I also have evidentiary search warrants in both cases. I believe Mr. Shook, the bottom line is you-all want saliva samples; is that correct?

MR. SHOOK: That is correct, Judge.

THE COURT: The facts have been recited in the affidavit. They have already been signed by a magistrate. The affiant has already sworn to them. Any other remark about that from the State? And I assume that you want to have those search warrants executed at this same time; is that correct?

MR. SHOOK: That's correct, Judge, and I believe the motions, probable cause speak for themselves, and the officers are standing by with the materials needed.

THE COURT: Okay. They appear to be in order.

Any other response from either Mr. Parks or Ms. Busbee?

	8	granted Ms. Busbee's motion for appointment of an investigator.
	9	I filed a motion some days ago but has that been
	10	THE COURT: And it very well may be here now
	11	that I have got two here it is. Let me put it in the other
	12	file, Mr. Parks. My clerk tells me we need to try real hard to
)	13	try to keep everything in the right file.
	14	That motion for court appointed investigator,
E	15	Mr. Parks, in the case of Donald Keith Newbury, that is also
pengad.con	16	granted. As a matter of fact I also signed that February 6.
PENGAD • 1-800-631-6989 • www.pengad.com	17	You have already had one 21 days.
• 1-800-63	18	THE COURT: Okay. Anything else?
	19	MS. BUSBEE: No.
98M B <b>39</b>	20	MR. PARKS: No.
LASER BOND FORM B	21	THE COURT: Sheriff, they can go back. And Mr.
LASE	22	Shook, I bet your people are ready to go.
	23	MR. SHOOK: They are, Judge.
Ŋ	24	(Proceedings adjourned)
	25	

Case 3:09-cv-01368-L-BN Document 127-4 Filed 12/13/17 Page 98 of 669 Page 10 2931

THE COURT: Ms. Busbee?

MS. BUSBEE: No, Your Honor.

same time. Anything else anybody would like to talk about?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

warrants, Your Honor.

MR. PARKS: Nothing with respect to the search

THE COURT: Then those will be executed at this

to

MR. PARKS: Your Honor, I noticed that you

1	STATE OF TEXAS )
2	COUNTY OF DALLAS )
3	I, SHARON HAZLEWOOD, deputy court reporter in and for
4	the 283rd Judicial District Court of Dallas County, State of
5	Texas, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing contains
6	a true and correct transcription of all portions of evidence
7	and other proceedings requested in writing by counsel for the
8	parties to be included in the reporter's record in the above
9	styled and numbered cause, all of which occurred in open court
10	or in chambers and were reported by me.
11	I further certify that this transcription of the
12	proceedings truly and correctly reflects the exhibits, if any,
13	offered by the respective parties.
14	I further certify that Dallas County did not pay a
15	substitute court reporter while I prepared this transcript.
16	WITNESS my hand, the 1st day of June, 2002.
17	Sharon Hazlewood
18	SHARON HAZLEWOOD, C.S.R.
19	Certification Number: 628
20	Date of Expiration: 12-31-2002
21*	283RD JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
22	Frank Crowley Courts Building
23	133 N. Industrial, LB33
24	Dallas, Texas 75207-4313
25	214/653-5674

Case 3 09-cv-01368-L-BN Document 127-4 Filed 12/13/17 Page 99 of 669 Pagel D 2932

#### REPORTER'S RECORD

74851

# VOLUME 5 OF 6 VOLUMES

TRIAL COURT CAUSE NO. F01-00328-T

STATE OF TEXAS \* IN THE DISTRICT COURT

VS. \* DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS

PATRICK HENRY MURPHY, JR. \* 283RD DISTRICT COURT

\*\*\*\*\*\*

#### JURY PANEL

#### QUESTIONNAIRES

FILED IN COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

MAR 9 - 2004

Troy C. Bennett, Jr., Clerk

On the 16th day of May 2003, morning session, the following proceedings came on to be heard in the above-entitled and numbered cause before the Honorable Vickers L. Cunningham, Sr., Judge Presiding, held in Dallas, Dallas County, Texas.

Proceedings reported by machine shorthand.

**ORIGINAL** 

24

23

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

25

#### APPEARANCES

#### APPEARING FOR THE STATE

Mr. Toby Shook SBOT NO. 18293250 And ' Mr. Bill Wirskye SBOT NO. 00788696 Assistant District Attorneys 133 No. Industrial Blvd. Dallas Texas 75207

#### APPEARING FOR THE DEFENDANT

Phone: 214/653-3600

Ms. Brook Busbee
Attorney at Law
SBOT: 03488000
703 McKinney Ave. Ste. 312
Dallas, TX 75202
214/754-9090

Mr. Juan Sanchez Attorney at Law SBOT: 00791599 5630 Yale Blvd. Dallas, TX 75206 214/365-0700

16

10

12

13

14

15

17 18

. 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

#### PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: Good morning. While I have you standing up, I'm going to swear everybody in to be a potential juror in this case. Please raise your right hands.

[At this time the jury panel was sworn by the Court.]

THE COURT: You may be seated. I have just sworn you in to be a venire juror. Here the answer is to tell the truth on the questions concerning your qualifications to be a juror in this case. We have a lot of people standing over here on the sides and the back. We have seats in the middle. If you would like to have a seat, please do so. I know it's hot. You may be more comfortable standing up.

We've asked the services this morning at 7:20 to turn the air down but your commissioners are trying to save money, bottom line. So if you are hot, I'm hot in this robe. I trust you that is the truth. All right.

Thank you for being down here. We have a lot of work to do today. I need to go over some issues with you in this case. At this time I'm going to call Cause No. F01-00328, State of Texas versus Patrick Murphy. What says the State?

MR. SHOOK: State's ready.

THE COURT: What says the defense?

MS. BUSBEE: Ready for this procedure,

Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes. Each of you have been summoned here today to be a juror in a capital murder case in which the State seeks the death penalty. I hear the pin drop. I know the Sheriff gave you a few preliminary instructions here. I have to go over some issues with you at this time. I'll read it straight out of the procedure book.

In a capital felony case in which the State seeks the death penalty, the Court shall propound to the entire panel of prospective jurors questions concerning the principles as applicable to the case on trial of reasonable doubt, burden of proof, return of indictment by a Grand Jury, presumption of innocence, and opinion.

So those issues I have to go over with you today. I'll try to do it as quickly as I can. I need to go over the qualifications and potential exemptions that you may have in this matter and we have a short questionnaire for you to fill out.

I'll start by introduction of the parties at this time. For the State, Mr. Toby Shook, Mr. Bill Wirskye, Tom D'Amore. All three of these gentlemen are Assistant District Attorneys working for your elected

District Attorney, Bill Hill.

Sanchez, Ms. Brook Busbee Alexander. And up here is the defendant, Patrick Murphy. You have already met the Sheriff, Bryan Cook. He's -- if I don't have the answer, he's got it. And our Court Reporter, Ms. Nancy Brewer. She that to record everything that we say. If we talk to somebody individually, we have to do it at the corner of the bench and let her make a record. So those are the parties.

Now, very, very important that you understand the qualifications to be on any jury, much less a capital case. I'm going to go over the qualifications and be sure this applies to each and every one of you here.

Must be of at least 18 years of age.

Must be a citizen of this State and of the county in which
you are to serve as a juror. Means Dallas County. About
the only excuse that I'm going to let anybody off of jury
service is I'm going to move out of Dallas County. And
beyond that, it's going to be really tough.

Must be qualified under the constitution and laws to vote in Dallas County. How many people remember years ago you didn't want to sign up to vote because you didn't want to be called for jury duty? We fixed that. We now use your drivers license information to summon people, so that it gives us a wider pool, a better cross-section of

our community, and lets everybody participate in jury service. The key is to have to be qualified to vote. You don't have to be registered to vote. You don't even have to vote. By the way I've got voters registration cards here in the back, if you would like to register for free.

Must be of sound mind and good moral character. Now that might apply to a few people. This is Dallas County. Now, you know the standard line is, Judge, I'm depressed and on Prozac or whatever. Well, it's 2003. And that's just, you know, if you get along in life, we need you to stay and fill out a questionnaire.

What do I mean by that? Truthfully, if you have a situation that is so on the forefront of your mind that you cannot serve. Let me give an example. I started a murder case and I will always remember this lady. It was up in my courtroom. And I seated the jury and told the folks this was a murder case. And a lady on the second row you could tell was visibly moved, shaken. Got up and left.

And the Sheriff asked her what the problem was and she had just buried her brother-in-law a week before who was murdered. So there's no way that she would be able to focus and sit for that type -- any other case down here, she would be fine. But that was just way, way too close to home. That's what we're talking about.

Must be able to read and write the English language. If you are a United States citizen, if you have been naturalized and you have taken an exam to be qual'ified, you are qualified, folks. I know English may not be your first language. You may think you have some difficulty. We want you to stay and fill out the questionnaire. It's an opportunity for you to serve.

Last one of the next ones is you must not have served as petit juror six days in the preceding six months in the county or six months in the district court.

Now, we've just started a new jury wheel, so I don't think that would catch anybody here, but it's a possibility. If you actually served for six days, that's in the jury box and heard a case. We very rarely have cases that last more than a week down here, so it's not likely that would be an issue for anyone. If it is, let me know.

Must not have been convicted of a felony in this state or any other state or any federal jurisdiction. A felony conviction excludes you from jury service forever. And we're not talking about a deferred probation. I'm talking about a conviction.

Must not be currently today under any legal indictment or accusation for any misdemeanor or felony theft. If you have a theft conviction of any type, that's hot check at the grocery store, you cannot serve on the jury

if you are currently accused, if you are pending, going to court, you are not qualified to serve at this time. You may be barred forever, but today you are not qualified.

What do I mean by a hot check? We're not talking about if you bounced a check at the bank. We're talking about you got arrested, you went to court, you were found guilty, a final conviction for theft. Not the letter from the DA's Office that says you have hot checks out.

Come down and pick them up or we'll file a case against you. If you went to a Judge, a JP, a county court Judge, and you were found guilty of theft by check, you are not qualified. If you think that issue applies to you, there's a place on this questionnaire for you to put it down.

If you come up and ask me this morning,

Judge, I think I've been convicted of a theft, I can't help

you this morning. That's no way we can check all these

records this morning. Put it in the questionnaire. Don't

talk to me because I can't answer it. Okay?

So these are your qualifications, exemptions. Now, you can elect to take an exemption and be excused from jury service. You don't have to. If you are over the 70 years of age, you don't have to serve on a jury anymore. If you are over 70 and you are here, we would like for you to stay. We need your experience, your wisdom, and your life history to add to the jury pool. We would like to

have you.

If you have legal custody of a child or children under the age of ten and your service on a jury would require that child or children to be left without adequate supervision. What that means is if you have a job and you have day care and your kids are taken care of, that's not going to be an exemption you can claim. We're going to work business hours.

If you are a student in public or private secondary school and if you have a student ID card, then you can claim an exemption. You need to be in school and that also goes for a person that is enrolled and actually a an institution of higher education. That doesn't mean a class at Eastfield at 8:00 at night. It won't work.

Remember who writes these laws. Next one, if you are an officer or employee of the legislative branch of state government, you do not have to serve. And we're not talking about folks just the 140 days they are in Austin. They wrote a blanket exemption forever. If they are an officer or employee of the legislative branch of state government. Amazing how that works, isn't it?

If you are the primary caretaker of a person who is an invalid. You take care of an aged parent or family member in your home and you don't work outside the home, it would require that person to be left without

adequate supervision, that's an exemption you may claim.

Like I said, if you had been on a jury in a case since May 1 of 2000 -- I don't know why that's on there. This is an old card. I already covered that. So those are your qualifications for potential exemption.

Now I will speak to those folks who have those issues in a few moments. But think about that while I go through the next phase of this voir dire. I'll now go through with you some of the issues that are required by law.

Reasonable doubt. The State has to prove any case in a criminal matter beyond a reasonable doubt.

They have to be able to present evidence to a jury to remove or beyond a reasonable doubt of the allegations they have alleged in the indictment.

Try to put this on a scale. In a civil case you typically go and argue about money or contracts or disputes involving property or custody. You have -- that standard in that case is by a preponderance, which means the greater weight and degree of credible evidence, fifty plus something percent. The issue is money.

The intermediate standard is clear and convincing. Very few people have heard of that standard. That would be used, for example, in a case where the State has filed a lawsuit to terminate your parental rights to

your children.

The example that I use and I hope I never have another one, everybody will remember the little girl locked in the closet, the nasty closet in the trailer for two years, was starved almost to death. They had four other children. And the State filed a petition to remove all the children and terminate the parents' custody of all the five children. Clear and convincing evidence is required to terminate their parental rights.

The highest burden in our courts is beyond a reasonable doubt. Why? You might lose your life or your liberty as a result of a conviction for a criminal case. So it gives you a logical process of how much evidence is required for the State to achieve their burden. It's not beyond all possible doubt. It's certainly not proof of one hundred percent.

Someone says, Judge, I understand the law, but I'm going to require the State to prove it to me beyond all doubt. If you think about how that statement would sound, you would have to be a witness to the actual crime for you to have no doubt as to what happened. So, therefore, you couldn't be on the jury. So it's a doubt based on reason.

I like this. This is Cunningham's definition. Common sense. If there's any one thing I want

Add it up. If the State meets their burden, find him guilty. If the State can't get there, find him not guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

Return of indictment by the Grand Jury.

The Grand Jury of Dallas County has returned an indictment in this case for capital murder. You say, Judge, I understand that. I know that the presumption of innocence alone is sufficient to acquit someone. But when they return an indictment, that means somebody has already looked at it. So that means something happened.

Well, let me -- I usually go through this and it takes about ten minutes. So I'll just give you the answers. The Dallas County Grand Jury this last year heard 27,000 cases. This man here stands charged as one person out of 27,000 that was indicted in Dallas County last year. You take the amount of time, divided by the number of cases that they have to hear, and you have three to four minutes per case to listen to some evidence being presented to them by an investigator that something happened.

So the twelve people who will ultimately hear this case will be the first citizens, really, to hear anything about this case in any depth. So when I give you the line that simply by being arrested, confined, or otherwise charged with a crime gives rise to no inference of

guilt at his trial, that's exactly what it means.

Presumption of innocence. The presumption of innocence, alone, is sufficient to acquit the defendant unless and until the State can prove his guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. You have got to come in, you have got to have the mental acuity and the honesty to be able to walk into a courtroom and say, I presume this man to be innocent regardless of what the allegations are until the State can prove it to me otherwise.

And I can't stress that enough, folks.

We just got through fighting a war in Iraq. If you made one of Saddam's buddies mad, they put you in a hole somewhere until your family could buy your way out. That's the flipside of the presumption of innocence. That's how strong I believe in that principle.

You don't -- the defense doesn't have to prove anything to you. They don't have to bring any evidence. It's the State's burden and it never shifts to the defendant. People confuse that. You see a three or four-minute snippet on TV where you see the lawyers blistering somebody on the witness stand and you confuse that with requiring the defendant to bring their own evidence. You don't have to. It's the State's burden. I can talk another 30 minutes on that, but I shall not.

Last thing is opinion. Folks, I've

already told you, you have been sworn in to tell the truth on these questionnaires. I've already told you we want you to bring your common sense into the courtroom. We want your honest opinions on these questionnaires.

Now, a sure way to get right back down here on a front row is to give some smart answer to a question. We had one juror that came in and, you know, just was the only way I can describe her attitude was hateful.

Okay? We've got too many things going on, folks. You are too busy in your life. We're too busy down here. We don't need that.

And if I ask anybody here, do you want to be on a capital murder case? The answer is no. If you do, there's something wrong. All right? So I understand where you are coming from.

I will make you two promises. You can ask anybody in this courthouse how I run a courtroom. I will not waste your time. Number one complaint down here from jurors is they hurry up and wait. This morning it just takes 30 minutes to get 550 people all seated.

Now, this is the step one. After we fill out the questionnaires, you would be invited back to the courtroom for individual voir dire where we go through this questionnaire, one juror at a time. And when you get called back down here, you will either have a morning session or

afternoon session. What I mean by that is, if you are called back, you will be down here at 8:30. We will be through with you by noon. If you have an afternoon session, we call you at 1:30 and we will be through by 4:30.

Step one is you have a couple of hours this morning and step two, you will have a few hours in a morning or afternoon session.

once the jury is picked, the procedure will be like a normal case. I heard the Sheriff talk to you about the timing in this matter. We will start the individual portion of the voir dire, the individual questioning, after school starts. I know people are wanting to travel on vacations during the summer. We're not going to bother you. And if you are on a normal working schedule, you have kids in school, that's fine. We will work around it. So I think school starts like August 15 or August 26. We will schedule you back at that time.

It will take approximately three months to get the jury selected. We anticipate having this trial concluded before Thanksgiving. I am not going to bother anybody over the Thanksgiving holidays. I want to be gone, too. So that gives you a timetable.

As I already told you, the only way, really, I'm going to let you off this panel is, Judge, my house is for sale or I have a contract. I'm moving out of

Dallas County. I will not be here in August. I'll talk to you. Beyond that, if you don't have a legal exemption or a qualification problem, don't come up.

Last thing I need to talk to you about is once you read this questionnaire, you will see on the second page that there's been some media coverage involving this case. I saw a camera. He's already gone. Media coverage down here on these cases, the newspaper, TV, is always around. If you think you have heard something about this case, fine. Put it down on the questionnaire.

But let me ask you this. You may have remembered something about this case in the media, but there's no way, no way that you have heard anything about this person on this particular offense. You may think you may have, but the bottom line is, if you can set aside anything that may have happened in the past and be able to say, Judge, I will hear the evidence from the witness stand and make my decision based on evidence submitted before this Court, that's what we're talking about. That's what we're talking about. You have an opportunity on the questionnaire to share your opinion on the media issue.

So with that -- all right, at this time the Sheriff is going to pass out the questionnaire. And as I heard Sheriff Cook tell you to put an A or B on your number on the top right-hand corner and circle the morning

or afternoon -- circle morning or afternoon panel. The way we contact you is by the phone numbers you provide and I would like to have E-mail, if you have got it.

The other thing I want to be sure you see is on the bottom of each page I want your juror number again on the bottom of the page, because we have these things just clipped up here. And at the end of the day we end up with 25,000 pages and two or three clips get pulled off and we don't have the juror number on each page, then we have to call you back down. Ms. Smith, sorry, we lost your questionnaire. We can't find it. It's in the box somewhere. Can you fill out another one?

This questionnaire, I know, is detailed.

It's basically what is your name, when were you born, and what happened next? And it does ask for a lot of confidential information. I will tell you that the parties are under Court order not to disclose any of this confidential information beyond the needs of this trial.

When the trial is concluded these records are sealed by the Court and only upon a court order by the Court of Criminal Appeals whether I release a copy to that Court. I mean, the Court of Criminal Appeals doesn't get a copy unless they send me a court order saying, Judge Cunningham, you must send us a copy, because I put it on them to maintain the integrity of these records.

So that's how we keep the chain of custody of these records, so you will understand that we have to have this information because we have got to be sure you are qualified and we need this confidential information. So if you have phone numbers, contact information, please provide that, so we can get back in touch with you.

And beyond that I think the Sheriff is ready to pass these out. If you would, Sheriff, get the questionnaires out to the folks. If you need to talk to me, and I stress "need", about a qualification problem, Judge, I've been to the penitentiary, can't serve. Okay? I want to claim an exemption. Fine, talk to me. If it's an issue about I don't know, I'm not sure, fill out the questionnaire. We'll get back with you.

So if you need to talk to me, I will have you line up by the corner by the Texas flag down the side of that wall and that way we can try to have some privacy, if there's a sensitive issue you need to talk about. So if you need to, come down. Come on down. Yes?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I live in Denton County.

THE COURT: No. 332, Mr. Robert

Blackstone. Mr. Blackstone, what is your issue?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I live in Denton

County.

```
THE COURT: Any objection.
                        MS. BUSBEE:
                                    No.
                        MR. SHOOK:
                                    No.
                        THE COURT: Yes, ma'am?
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm first of June
    moving to Cedar Creek Lake. I believe that is in Kaufman
    County.
                        THE COURT: Any objection?
                       MS. BUSBEE:
                                    No.
                        THE COURT: No. 1614 Debra Berrins, you
10
    are excused.
11
12
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I didn't file for an
    exemption because --
13
14
                       THE COURT: No. 243 George Graf, G-R-A-F,
    and he's with DTS as a student. So you are full-time
15
    student, DTS?
16
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. I had the
17
    summer off, but I'm a full-time student.
18
19
                       THE COURT: That's an exemption we will
    let you have. Yes, your name?
20
21
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Damion Ford, F-O-R-D.
                       THE COURT: No. 1856. Yes?
22
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm attending school
23
    at Cedar Valley and I didn't know that I was going to bring
24
    an ID badge or anything.
25
```

```
THE COURT: Are you a full-time student?
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
                        THE COURT: And, what, are you in school
    right now or just finished classes?
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I'm in school
    now.
                       THE COURT: What does your fall look
    like?
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm not going to
    school.
10
11
                       THE COURT: Then you are qualified. You
    don't have an exemption. Fill that out for us. Thank you,
12
    sir. Yes, ma'am? We have Jo Carroll Erwin, E-R-W-I-N, No.
13
    528. Yes, ma'am?
14
15
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I've been in a
    federal prison before.
16
17
                       THE COURT: FIC, so that's a final felony
    conviction. Any objection?
18
19
                       MR. SHOOK: No.
                       MS. BUSBEE: No.
20
21
                                   Thank you, ma'am. You are
                       THE COURT:
    free to go. Yes? We have No. 253, Mr. Shawn Reynolds.
22
23
    Yes?
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Attending school.
24
   have my schedule here, current class, and I'm transferring
25
```

```
to Brookhaven next month. I'm taking three classes.
                        THE COURT: Are you a full-time student?
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not a full-time
    student, no, sir.
                        THE COURT: What does your fall look
    like?
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm going to be
    taking three classes.
                       MR. SHOOK: During the day?
10
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, early evening.
                       THE COURT: They don't have the times
11
    here. I see the start and end date.
12
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, it doesn't,
13
14
    you're right. But I'm transferring next month to
    Brookhaven?
15
                       MR. SHOOK: We can agree.
16
                       THE COURT: Parties have agreed.
17
                                                          Thank
    you, Mr. Reynolds. Have good luck in school. Yes? We have
18
    No. 838, Mr. William McLemon.
19
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It's McLemore.
20
    always misspell it.
21
                       THE COURT: You have been to TDC?
22
23
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. Well, I was --
    I did time in Decker.
24
25
                       THE COURT: Have you been on parole?
```

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
                        MR. SHOOK: What type of --
                        THE COURT: What kind of case was it?
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Three DWIs.
                        THE COURT: Three?
                        MS. BUSBEE: So it was a felony, the last
    one?
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                            Yes.
                        MS. BUSBEE: No question about it.
                        THE COURT: No question about it.
10
    you, sir.
11
12
                        THE COURT: Navy recruiter?
                                            That's me.
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
13
                        THE COURT: You are not going to be
14
    shipped out any time, are you?
15
16
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                        THE COURT: No. 1821, Mr. Ungel Harris.
17
    Why wouldn't we want you?
18
19
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Because I still have
    a case pending. I have a lawsuit against Florida I have to
20
    flip that case.
21
22
                       THE COURT: You have been accused of
    shipping cocaine.
                       All right.
23
                       MR. SHOOK: Pending felony. I hope you
24
25
    take care of your case.
```

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: The State dropped it
    and the Fed picked it up, so I had to do the Feds case.
    They had to drop it because it wasn't me. So the Feds
    picked it up.
                        THE COURT: Yes? No. 1571, Mr. Harry
    Flood.
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I work at night and I
    had to stay up all night. If I have to, I just wanted to
    say that. I'm standing talking to you and I'm asleep.
                       THE COURT: Can you stay awake long
10
    enough to fill out the questionnaire?
11
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: And I have a DWI.
12
                       THE COURT: DWI won't hurt you.
13
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I plan to go to my
14
          I left my glasses. The guy, he filled out mine for
15
    me, but I couldn't see it. I left my glasses.
16
                       THE COURT: Go get your glasses, if you
17
    need them.
18
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: You will let me go
19
    for my glasses?
20
                       THE COURT:
21
                                   Sure.
22
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Cool.
23
                       THE COURT: No. 2220, Brandy Reznicek.
   And you are currently accused of a felony or theft?
24
25
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Do I explain?
```

THE COURT: Yes.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: What it is, is we had a car reported stolen and when we go to get it, when we recovered the car, after it got towed, apparently it was still showing. So I got pulled over in it. So before my husband could get there with the paperwork, it was supposed to be dismissed, but I don't have any final paperwork.

MS. BUSBEE: Yes.

MR. SHOOK: Yes.

THE COURT: Thank you. Ma'am. The parties have agreed you are excused.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: No. 905 Steven Sims. Yes?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm a member of the

NBC media. I work for -- I'm familiar with a portion of this and so --

THE COURT: Certainly you wouldn't let the media influence your opinion, would you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It wouldn't influence my opinion.

THE COURT: Great. Fill out the questionnaire for us. We really appreciate it. Yes, ma'am?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I no longer live in Dallas County.

THE COURT: That will work. Can I have your card? No. 159, Jennifer Schauer.

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I live in -- it's
    been changed to Player (phonetic). I got married.
                        THE COURT: You are not qualified.
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I live in Tarrant
    County now.
                       THE COURT: Yes? No. 1779, Mr. Jose
    Melendez. Yes?
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I cannot write and
    read properly.
                       THE COURT: How long have you lived here,
10
    sir?
11
12
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Six years in Dallas.
13
                       THE COURT: Six years in Dallas?
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
14
                       THE COURT: Where do you work?
15
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't work right
16
    now because I'm sick.
17
18
                       THE COURT: You are sick?
19
                       MR. SHOOK: Agree.
20
                       MS. BUSBEE: I didn't understand what the
    exemption was.
21
22
                       MR. SHOOK: Can't read or write.
                       MS. BUSBEE: I'll agree. That's fine.
23
                       THE COURT: Thank you, sir. You are
24
25
    excused.
```

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                            I'm sorry.
                       THE COURT: Yes? No. 1472, Waylon
    Pomroy. Yes?
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm a diabetic and
    have high blood pressure and I didn't know if it would
    interfere with your trial.
                       THE COURT: It won't interfere with my
    trial. Put that on the questionnaire. It has a portion on
    there.
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
10
                                           Thank you.
                       THE COURT: Yes, ma'am. Number?
11
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have my 93-year-old
12
    mother with me. She's not bedridden, but she couldn't get
13
    around and prepare meals.
.14
15
                       THE COURT: No. 1455, Bonnie stoner.
    We'll let you claim an exemption. Thank you, ma'am.
16
                       MS. BUSBEE: Yes.
17
                       MR. SHOOK: Yes.
18
                       THE COURT: Yes, ma'am? No. 1830 is
19
    Cecilia, O-B-A-Z-U-G-H-A-H-M-W-A-N.
20
21
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm a resident.
                                                            I'm
   not a citizen.
22
                       THE COURT: You are not a citizen?
23
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm a resident.
24
25
                       THE COURT: Not qualified. Thank you,
```

```
ma'am, you are excused. Number -- difficult name, 2427
    Chounlamany.
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I just bought a house
    in Tarrant County and closing in two weeks and we'll be
    moving.
                       THE COURT: Tarrant County. Thank you,
    sir. You are excused. No. 1849, Veronica Rich.
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I sold my house and
    will be moving out of Dallas County.
                       THE COURT: That will work. Where?
10
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Hunt County.
11
                       THE COURT: Thank you very much. You are
12
    excused. Yes? No. 489, Mr. Oscar Burrell, Jr.
13
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm on medication
14
    which includes Lasix, which is a dieretic and I brought my
15
    prescription. My doctor is out of town, so --
16
                       THE COURT: It won't bother you.
17
    fill out the questionnaire and put it on the questionnaire
18
   where it asks.
19
20
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.
21
                       THE COURT: Yes, ma'am? No. 2184
   McCarter.
22
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have a brother
23
   incarcerated and I feel I wouldn't make a good juror, a
24
   judge. I couldn't do that. He's incarcerated for 13 and a
25
```

```
half years in the state of Texas.
                       THE COURT: I understand that, but we
    need people from all perspectives and all walks of life to
    participate.
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'll do my best.
                       THE COURT: Fill it out on your
    questionnaire.
                    I'm sure they will ask that you just put
    that on there. Yes? No. 880, John Harris. Yes?
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My school started.
    I'll be out of the county. I'll in Rains County, then
10
    moving.
11
                       THE COURT: Are you a full-time student?
12
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, moving.
13
                       THE COURT: Any problems?
14
                       MS. BUSBEE: No.
15
                       MR. SHOOK: No.
16
                       THE COURT: Thank you, sir. You are
17
    excused. Yes? No. 648, Stephen Fejes. Okay.
18
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I live in Dallas
19
   County, but I actually work in Brazil. I come back and
20
    forth.
21
                       THE COURT: How long does it take you to
22
23
   get down here?
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Two days.
24
                       THE COURT: Gee.
25
```

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I fly into Miami and
    then Sapolo (phonetic).
                       THE COURT: Are you gone a month?
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: A week here and three
    weeks there.
                       MR. SHOOK: We can agree.
                       MS. BUSBEE: Yes.
                       THE COURT: The parties have agreed.
    you don't have to serve on this jury yes. No. 1360, Rick
    Von Pfeil.
10
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Moving to Collin
11
    County.
12
                       THE COURT: Collin County.
13
    Qualification. When are you moving?
14
15
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: By July 15th.
                       THE COURT: By July 15th?
16
                       MR. SHOOK: That will do it.
17
                       THE COURT: You are excused. No. 1169,
18
    Lakisha Williams.
19
20
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm still in high
    school.
21
22
                       THE COURT: How old are you?
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Nineteen.
                       THE COURT: Will you be in high school
24
    this fall?
25
```

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                            I graduate next
    January.
                        THE COURT: That's an exemption. Any
    problems?
                       MS. BUSBEE: No.
                       MR. SHOOK: No.
                        THE COURT: Good luck with school. No.
    2106, Angela Jones. Yes, ma'am?
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have a problem with
    reading and filling this out.
10
                       THE COURT: Have you looked at it and
11
    have you tried to fill out the first couple of pages?
12
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I could probably fill
13
    out the first page, but questions, I'm not going to be able
14
    to.
15
16
                       MS. BUSBEE: Agree.
                       MR. SHOOK:
17
                                   Agree.
18
                       THE COURT:
                                   The parties have agreed to
    excuse you. Thank you, Ms. Jones. No. 1970, Peter Whipkey.
19
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I will be in school
20
    full-time in the fall. I'm currently enrolled.
21
                       THE COURT: El Centro full-time?
22
23
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. Studying
    computers.
24
25
                       THE COURT: You will be a full-time
```

```
student this fall?
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I will.
                        THE COURT:
                                    Agree?
                        MR. SHOOK:
                                    Agree.
                        THE COURT: Thank you. Exemption. Yes,
    ma'am? No. 485, Lorraine Grover.
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have a terminally
    ill husband who will be coming home this weekend they were
    giving him 206 months to live and I will be the one taking
    care of him.
10
11
                       MS. BUSBEE: Agreed.
                       MR. SHOOK: Agree.
12
13
                        THE COURT: You need to be with your
              The parties have agreed and our prayers are with
    husband.
14
    you. No. 888, Carmencita Cobb.
15
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have a freshman in
16
    high school. I pick her up at school at 4:00. Would that
17
    affect --
18
                       THE COURT: You have a freshman in high
19
    school?
20
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: And she gets off at
21
    4:00 in the afternoon.
22
23
                       MS. BUSBEE:
                                    Agree.
                       MR. SHOOK: Agree.
24
25
                       THE COURT: The parties have agreed.
```

are excused. No. 688, Mr. Juan Villarreal. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was found guilty on a DWI charge. THE COURT: Won't hurt you. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Excuse me? THE COURT: No problem. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No problem? THE COURT: No, sir. MR. SHOOK: Is it a misdemeanor? THE COURT: How many DWIs have you had? 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: One. 11 THE COURT: No problem. No. 793 Yvonne 12 Freeman. 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have like two or 14 I'm in the process of going on medical retirement 15 and then I've got a son in special ed going through some 16 problems now and I have a family member in prison for --17 MS. BUSBEE: We agree. 18 MR. SHOOK: We agree. No. 793? 19 20 THE COURT: No. 793. Thank you, ma'am. 21 You are excused. No. 1458, Rosa Sanchez? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I think I don't 22 understand anything. I'm sorry. I can talk to you, but I 23 can't --24 25 MS. BUSBEE: We can agree. I've talked

to her husband. THE COURT: The parties have agreed. Thank you for coming down. No. 2265, Patricia Buttery. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Right. I'm going to be 70 in two weeks. I want to be exempt so I can travel. MS. BUSBEE: Okay with me. MR. SHOOK: Okay. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: In two weeks by the time the contract comes about. THE COURT: We start the case today so 10 11 it's 70 today? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: But when you call me. 12 MS. BUSBEE: We're not going to aggravate 13 you. We don't want you. 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I've been down here 15 many times on juries, so I think that I have paid my dues. 16 THE COURT: Okay. They've agreed. Have 17 Your name? It's going to be all right. This is No. fun. 18 1047, Blythe Schroeder. 19 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I live in Irving and I'm a single mom with three kids and I was going to 21 Christmas Eve church when the ambulance went by me. 22 was just at Oshman's yesterday and they renamed the street 23 behind and my kids boys are --24 25 MS. BUSBEE: Agree.

```
MR. SHOOK:
                                    Agree.
                        THE COURT: Okay. We'll agree. No. 311,
    Shekeysa Ealey.
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I attend school in
    Alabama and I'm leaving in August to go back to school.
                        THE COURT: Where do you go to school?
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: In Alabama Oakwood
    College in Alabama.
                                    That will give you an
                        THE COURT:
    exemption.
10
                        THE COURT:
11
                                    Study hard. You are free to
    go. No. 1450, Nancy Robinson.
12
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I've booked -- my
13
    husband and I have booked a cruise October 26 through
14
    November 12. Is that --
15
                       THE COURT:
                                   That's the target date.
16
    We're going to be right in the middle of trial in that
17
    period.
18
19
                       MR. SHOOK:
                                   You wouldn't mind missing
20
    that, would you?
21
                       MS. BUSBEE: You get paid six dollars a
    day.
22
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I filled that out and
23
    I thought maybe I better.
24
                       MR. SHOOK: We can agree.
25
```

MS. BUSBEE: Yes. THE COURT: They have agreed to let you go on your cruise. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My husband thanks you. THE COURT: No. 1211, Diane Johnson. Yes, ma'am? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My daughter was murdered last year, so I won't be able to stay. MR. SHOOK: 10 We agree. THE COURT: Parties have agreed. 11 You are free to go. No. 725, Frank Arena? 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My concern is that my 13 job didn't pay me. I don't mind sacrificing two or three 14 15 weeks in the event I was picked, but possibly you could apply political pressure to where I work and ask them to pay 16 I heard of a case like that where the Judge actually 17 called someone up. 18 THE COURT: Well, at this point I can 19 tell you that I anticipate the trial will only last two 20 weeks, not three. And if you would go ahead and fill that 21 out and put on there that you are self-employed. 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 23 I'm not self-employed. I work for someone and we don't get paid for something like that. And I was wondering if it went on two

25

or three months, political pressure could be applied. MR. SHOOK: Where do you work? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: An auto dealership, 711. THE COURT: Put that on the questionnaire. No. 38, Mr. Adel. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I just read the case. I'm too close. A friend of mine, work, was buddy with the officer. We heard a lot about it and --10 MR. SHOOK: We can agree. 11 THE COURT: Thank you, sir. You are excused. No. 860, Mr. Ricky Grogan. 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I thought that I 13 could fill this out. Some of these questions in there I 14 have some mixed emotions because I've had an uncle murdered 15 here in Dallas County, Michael Perkins. And so I went --16 and I have a grandfather down in Huntsville serving a life 17 sentence. So starting to fill it out, thinking no problem, 18 but some of the questions I get into, it's more than I think 19 I really want to deal with. 20 21 MS. BUSBEE: If you agree, I will agree. MR. SHOOK: We will agree. 22 THE COURT: Thank you. The parties have 23 agreed to excuse you. 24 25 [End of Volume]

STATE OF TEXAS

COUNTY OF DALLAS

I, NANCY BREWER, Official Court Reporter for the 283rd Judicial District Court, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing constitutes a true and correct transcription of all portions of evidence and other proceedings requested in writing by counsel for the parties to be included in this volume of the Reporter's Record, in the above-styled and numbered cause, all of which occurred in open court or in chambers and were reported by me.

WITNESS MY OFFICIAL HAND on this the \_\_\_\_ day of

NANCY BREWER, CSR, NO. 5759
Expiration Date: 12-31-04
Official Reporter, 283rd JDC
Frank Crowley Crts. Bldg. LB33
133 No. Industrial Blvd.
Dallas, TX 75207
(214)653-5863

74851

#### REPORTER'S RECORD

# VOLUME 6 OF ( VOLUMES

TRIAL COURT CAUSE NO. F01-00328-T

STATE OF TEXAS \*

IN THE DISTRICT COURT

VS.

DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS

PATRICK HENRY MURPHY, JR.

283RD DISTRICT COURT

\*\*\*\*\*\*

INDIVIDUAL VOIR DIRE

\*\*\*\*\*\*

COURT OF CRIMINA APPEALS

MAR 9 - 2004 Troy C. Bennett, Jr., Clerk

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

10

11

12

On the 16th day of May, 2003, afternoon session, the following proceedings came on to be heard in the above-entitled and numbered cause before the Honorable Vickers L. Cunningham, Sr., Judge Presiding, held in Dallas, Dallas County, Texas.

Proceedings reported by machine shorthand.

21

22

23

24

25

ORIGINAL

# APPEARANCES

## APPEARING FOR THE STATE

Mr. Toby Shook
SBOT NO. 18293250
And
Mr. Bill Wirskye
SBOT NO. 00788696
Assistant District Attorneys

133 No. Industrial Blvd.

Dallas, Texas 75207 Phone: 214/653-3600

### APPEARING FOR THE DEFENDANT

Ms. Brook Busbee Attorney at Law SBOT: 03488000 703 McKinney Ave. Ste. 312 Dallas, TX 75202 214/754-9090

Mr. Juan Sanchez Attorney at Law SBOT: 00791599 5630 Yale Blvd. Dallas, TX 75206 214/365-0700

16

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18 19

20 21

22

23

24 25

> 283RD JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT 214/653-5863 NANCY BREWER, OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

#### PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: Good afternoon. I'm going to have you stand in just a second. We're looking for a couple more lawyers. There they are. Okay. If everybody would raise your right hand. I need everybody to raise your hand to take an oath to be a juror at this time.

[At this time the jury panel was sworn by the Court.]

THE COURT: Thank you. You may be seated. If you can't find a seat, stand along the walls in the back. Each of you when you received your summons to be down here on a special venire, I have some things that I must do with you statutorily. And I'll follow up on some of the instructions the Sheriff gave you.

You have been summoned here on what is referred to as a special venire in the case of the State of Texas versus Patrick Murphy. In a capital felony case in which the State seeks the death penalty, the Court shall propound to the entire panel of prospective jurors questions concerning the principles as applicable to the case on trial of the following, reasonable doubt, burden of proof, return of indictment by the Grand Jury, presumption of innocence, and opinion. So that's what I have to do statutorily here this afternoon.

I will go through your qualifications to

serve on any jury, exemptions to jury service in general for any case, and then I will take specific questions.

At this time I will introduce the parties. We have the State of Texas being represented by Mr. Toby Shook, Bill Wirskye, Tom D'Amore. The defendant, Mr. Patrick Murphy, up here, is represented by Ms. Brook Busbee Alexander and Mr. Juan Sanchez. And the Sheriff that you heard from earlier is Bryan Cook over here. If I don't have the answer, he does.

So we do have a few seats here in the middle of the aisle, if somebody would like to have a seat. Raise your hand, if there's a seat next to you. If there's a seat next to you, raise your hand. If you want a seat, just come in and find one. It's going to be a while. I don't want to say make yourself comfortable. We have too many people here to be comfortable and it's hot. I know it's hot. Try putting a robe on. I know it's hot. But please find a seat, if you want to. You will be here for a little while filling out a questionnaire here in a minute. Plenty of seats in the middle, if you want one. If you don't want one, that's fine. Just stand up. Okay.

You know you are down here for jury service on a special venire on a capital murder case in which the State seeks the death penalty. To serve on any jury you have to be qualified with these following

parameters on any case. No. 1, you must be at least 18 years of age. No. 2, you must be a citizen of Dallas County, Texas.

Now, the people I invite to come down and talk to me, about the only way that you can get out of the jury service on this case is if you are moving out of Dallas County. Short of that, you are not going to do very well.

Now, I'll give you the dates. The best example I have is my house has a contract. We're closing. I'm moving to Collin County. Well, we can't use you. I know about how many people should be selling their houses, so we'll catch up to that.

You must be qualified under the

Constitution and the laws of Texas to vote in Dallas County.

You don't have to be registered to vote. How many people remember the only way you got jury service was to be a registered voter? And you ask somebody to register to vote, oh, no, I don't want to be called for jury service. We fixed that, you see. We fixed it. Now we use your drivers license. So we're going to catch you.

But you have to be qualified. If you are not registered to vote or if you need to change your voters registration address, we have those cards available here for you at your convenience. It's free and we would like to have a current address for you. We want you to vote, but

you don't have to.

No. 4, you must be of sound mind and good moral character. That will catch a few people. What am I talking about? Standard line is, Judge, I'm depressed. I'm on Prozac or whatever. Hello, this is Dallas. That won't work.

Now, let me give you an example of what I'm talking about. I will always use, which I hope I don't have another example, but it's a good one. I had a jury come to my courtroom upstairs and I had them in the panel as a group to start voir dire like we're doing now and informed the panel that we're going to hear a murder case.

A lady on the second row obviously was moved, visibly shaken, and she gets up and leaves. She doesn't even ask. She just leaves and the Sheriff goes after her. Ma'am, what's the matter? She had just buried her brother-in-law that was murdered the week before and she came on down to jury service. There's no way that she was going to be able to have any focus at all with such a recent traumatic event. That's what we're talking about.

It probably won't apply here because our trial date is way off. So I don't anticipate anybody down here with that situation. I hope you don't have that. But if you do, we'll ask you to write that down on your questionnaire.

Must be able to read and write the English language. Now, how many people here speak English, but it's not your first language? Okay. If you are a U.S., naturalized citizen, and you had to take an English exam to be a citizen, you can be a juror.

Now, this is -- probably we have a few people that even though this morning, Judge, I've been here 20 years. I've tried to complete the questionnaire. I simply don't understand some of the legal words that are asking for my opinion here. We probably need to talk to you. But you are going -- I'm going to have you try to fill it out and see how well you can do.

In Dallas County this really doesn't apply, but I'll read it. You must not have served as a petit juror for six days in the preceding three months in the county court or six months in a district court.

What that means is if you were actually sworn in and sat on a jury, in the jury box, on a felony case or a civil case and were actually on the jury -- this is not jury duty in that sense -- and you served for six days. Our jury wheel takes three years to go through the jury wheel, so I doubt that somebody here would have served three months in the county court or six months in the district court. But if you were at the end of the old one and beginning the new one, it could happen.

Must not have been convicted of a felony offense in this state or any other state or any federal jurisdiction. If you have a final felony conviction, you are not qualified to serve on a jury from now on. What does that mean? If you are on deferred for a felony, that's deferred probation, you are qualified. We need to know about it. But you are still qualified.

You must not have any grade of theft conviction. If you have ever been convicted of theft, you are not qualified. I'm talking about theft where you -- even a hot check. I'm not talking about a hot check you write to Minyards' and you go pick it up. I'm not talking about a hot check that the DA's Office sent you a letter that said we're going to file a case on you, if you don't come down here and take care of your business.

Only type of theft conviction I'm talking about is if you actually wrote a hot check, you were arrested, you had to go before a Judge, and you were found guilty of theft by check or any grade of theft up to felony. That's what excludes you from being on jury service.

A conviction for DWI, unless you have got the third DWI, which is a felony, you are fine for jury service. Don't tell me, Judge, I got a DWI. I can't serve. Thank you so much. Have a seat and fill out the questionnaire. Okay?

You currently cannot be under a legal indictment or legal accusation for any misdemeanor or felony theft or any other felony. So if you are currently charged with an offense, but haven't been found guilty, haven't even gone to court yet, you are not qualified to sit right now. Your status may change in the future. But simply by being accused of a crime, we don't want you on both sides of the system. Makes sense, doesn't it?

Those are your qualifications. Each of you in this room have to meet those qualifications. Now, you may have an exemption that you wish to use to avoid jury service. If you are over 70 years of age, you can say, Judge, I appreciate the opportunity. I don't want to take it. We would like to have you stay. We need people with a lot of life experience and wisdom to serve on juries. We certainly would appreciate it, if you would.

If you have legal custody of a child or children younger than the age of ten and service on a jury would require you to leave that child or children without adequate supervision. If you work a normal job, we work normal business hours here. That wouldn't be a problem.

If you are a student of a public or private secondary school. I did have one high school student this morning. And or if you are a person enrolled and in actual attendance in an institution of higher

education. I'm not talking about taking a computer class at El Centro at night. It won't get there. We're talking about a full-time student.

Now, remembers who writes these rules. Your legislators in Austin. Listen to this one. If you are an officer or employee of the legislative branch of state government, you never have to serve on jury duty, whether you are up in Ardmore, Oklahoma, or not. Once again, remember who writes these rules. They carved themself an exemption and that's not just when they are in session. This is forever. So, there again, those are the ones who make the rules.

If you are the primary caretaker of a person who is an invalid. If you have an aged parent who lives in your home. Once again, it would require them to be left without adequate supervision or some special needs person where you are normally there during the day where you can take care of them, you have an exemption. If you work a regular job, folks, that's not going to get there.

So those are your exemptions and I'll talk to a very few people who need to talk to me in a few minutes about that. Now, I need to go through the statutory required issues before we proceed any further with the questionnaires. I need to talk to you about these following principles of reasonable doubt.

The State has to prove their case to you in any criminal indictment situation beyond a reasonable doubt. What does that mean? Well, I don't have a definition for you, but the best thing that I can do is give you a scale to have you understand how important these cases are. You go to a civil court to argue about things, contracts, money disputes, whether or not somebody moved a trailer to your neighborhood. That was one that was in the paper lately. You want a civil court to enforce a civil sanction. The issue is money, generally, or don't do something on a civil matter. Standard in that case is by a preponderance of the evidence. You have to prove your case, just tilt the scale in your favor, 51 percent. Why? The issue is money.

~ 23

Intermediate standard is clear and convincing. Very few people have heard of that. The type of example I can use is if the State were to file a lawsuit to terminate your parental rights to your children. My standard is over my dead body, but the legal standard for my kids and your kids is clear and convincing.

Example. You may remember the horrible case, and I hope I never have another one like this, but the little girl that was locked in the closet in the nasty trailer for two years. That family and four other children. The State filed a lawsuit to terminate all five children.

The petition was filed. The standard in that case is clear and convincing evidence.

The highest burden in our court system is beyond a reasonable doubt in a criminal case. It makes sense because you might lose your life or your liberty. So it's a logical process. How high does proof have to be? Well, it's not beyond all possible doubt. It's certainly not proof of one hundred percent. It's a doubt based on reason. And I like to use the word, Cunningham's definition, "common sense". We have to have a reason.

The State has to prove certain things to the jury. If they have failed to meet their burden on any one of the required elements and you have a reasonable doubt, sure, not guilty. It's their job.

Now, some people say, Judge, this is a case where the State seeks the death penalty. I want to be absolutely sure. Well, the only way that you can be absolutely sure about anything is if you were a witness to the particular criminal episode. If you were a witness, you couldn't be on the jury, because the jury would be listening to you. So you see that doesn't work, does it? It's certainly not a standard of one hundred percent because nothing in the world is 100 percent sure. It's a workable standard, so reasonable doubt.

Burden of proof. I said several times

the burden of proof is always on the State and it never shifts to the defense. Mr. Murphy or his lawyers do not have to present any evidence. People confuse this when you see this on TV. You get the four minute bite on a TV drama courtroom show and you see that the defense attorney blisters some witness and you confuse that with requiring the defendant to produce evidence. The defendant has no burden to produce any evidence. They're not bringing the charges. The State is those who are doing the accusing, have to do the proving. So you can never shift the burden and say I would require the defendant to do X. You can't do that.

Return of indictment by the Grand Jury. Some people say, Judge, you know, where there's smoke there's fire. Mr. Murphy has been indicted for capital murder. Something must have happened. Well, all I can tell you is we have a dispute of the facts and we need twelve people to be fair and impartial and listen to the whole case. You say the Grand Jury returned an indictment, they did something. Well, they did. Last year in Dallas County they heard 27,000 cases. That doesn't count 65 plus thousand cases for A and B misdemeanors, almost 100,000 cases in the courthouse this year alone.

So if you have two brain cells working together, you can figure out that the Grand Jury heard

27,000 cases. They spent about two to three minutes on this case, which means they heard very, very, very, very little, if anything, that was substantive about this case. So what that means is the twelve people who would be impaneled on this case will be the first citizens of Dallas County that will hear any of this case in detail.

The indictment is simply an accusation that the State has filed that says we will prove this to a jury. So I will give you a written instruction that says, simply by being arrested, confined, or otherwise charged with an offense, gives rise to no inference of guilt at his trial.

Which leads me to the last thing, presumption of innocence. Any citizen who is accused of a crime is presumed innocent. Though he may be indicted by the Grand Jury, you must presume Mr. Murphy innocent, because you have heard no evidence. Some people have a problem with that. And if you do, that's fine. We simply need to know about it. But I can't tell you how much I believe in that principle because it would take me another hour and y'all don't want to be here. I know y'all don't want to be here, there's something wrong.

You tell someone a capital murder case and if you are stepping up on the front row, I want to be on

this jury, we have a problem. So I know you don't want to be here. But it's one of those things your government has called you to serve.

Now, presumption of innocence. I try to pare it down. But we have just got through fighting a war about this type of stuff. If you make one of Saddam's buddies mad over in Iraq, you get put in prison until your family could buy your way out or prove your innocence, if you will. That's called shifting the burden.

People say, Judge, you know, the defendant is going to have to prove his innocence to me.

No, it doesn't work that way. The presumption of innocence alone is sufficient to acquit the defendant unless and until the State can prove each and every element required in their indictment beyond a reasonable doubt. I can go an hour and a half on that one statement alone. But for right now you have got to have the mental acuity, you have to be smart enough and honest enough to say, yes, I understand that.

Our Constitution is based on that. Our whole criminal justice system is based on that. And I will follow the law. I will wait until I hear the evidence before I make a decision.

Last thing is opinion. We need your honest opinions to the questions that are going to be asked of you in this questionnaire. The questionnaire is 20 pages

or so. Yes, I know. Asks you, what's your name, when were you born, and what happened next? And the reason we have these questionnaires is for this type of case.

Me'll spend all day today talking to big panels. The lawyers will review these questionnaires for the next three months. At the end of the day we'll have 25,000 pages to read. Then we call in jurors, each of you, one at a time, to the court and discuss your questionnaire individually. That process will begin after school starts in August. Whenever, I haven't checked with my wife. I don't know when DISD starts, but we'll start individual jury selection after school, because you want to be out for vacation for summer, if you have a family. I understand that. That's why we're starting this early.

So I anticipate individual will start sometime in mid-August, the last week in August, whatever the calendar tells us. And I can't tell you exactly when the trial will begin, but it will be sometime in November. And I hope to have the trial concluded before Thanksgiving. Nobody wants to be involved in these types of trials over the holidays.

I anticipate the actual trial itself will last two weeks. So that gives you a somewhat of a roadmap of where we're going. Nothing this summer, start individual

in August, take a couple of three months for that, and start the trial sometime in November. That's the best I can do as a time estimate. So if you are moving out of Dallas County before November, then you can talk to me.

Opinion, like I say, we want your honest opinions and your fair opinions. We get some kind of screwball answer on a question, the lawyers are going to want to talk to you about that. So what am I saying is be honest and be fair. I mean, we had a lady a couple of weeks ago. She was just in a bad mood. I can use another adjective, but I won't use it. But she was in a foul mood. And I can react several different ways. But, folks, I have other things that I need to do.

So we have plenty to do handling just what we have to do. We need to leave the attitudes out of it. And if you don't want to be down here, join the club. And I just want to stress that. So just give us a fair, honest, good faith effort on these questionnaires.

Now, when you get the questionnaire, I think the Sheriff told you to put your number at the top and then circle afternoon questions. I won't go through the details, but we need to know that you are in the afternoon panel. And on each page I need to have your number because they were just clipped together with a binder. And if they get pulled apart, we have a box full of a thousand

questionnaires and we have your top page with nothing else but your name on it, so we have to call you back down here to do it again. So put your number on each page, so if it gets pulled apart, we can find out where it goes. Fair enough?

Let me try to run traps for you on the excuses. I've heard them all. A guy, Judge, I can't miss work. I won't get paid. I'm sorry. I can't help you. I understand that. This is like paying taxes. You don't want to do it, but sometimes you have just got to strap it on and go to Baghdad. All right? This is one of the highest callings that you can have to participate in your government. I can't help you with a business excuse.

Typical one if I have a trial this week is, Judge, I'm going out of town on Thursday. Well, that won't apply here simply because I'm cutting out all the vacation time. That won't be an issue. You have far enough lead time that you can plan your travel arrangements around a trial in November. After we get into it in August we will have a firm trial date. If you are called back in August, we will have a firm trial date. And if it's monumental, we can work around it.

Judge, I'm a sole proprietor, no one to run my business. I understand that. The law doesn't help you.

So what am I trying to tell you? Come up here and visit. Beyond a felony conviction or you are moving out of Dallas County, I'm going to say, please have a seat, fill out the questionnaire, and put your issue on a questionnaire because there's no way that I can talk but to just a few people.

So, Sheriff, would you like to pass out the questionnaires for us. Last thing I need to talk to you about is media. There are no cameras here this afternoon. But this is a capital murder case and the media does cover these trials. If you think you know anything about this case, chances are you may have heard something about it in the news. You have no idea what this individual is, in fact, charged with or particular case in general. You might have some idea, but there's no way that you have heard any detail to a sufficient degree to really know anything about this case.

We did have one lady this morning that did know a lot about it through her personal connection and she was too close. But short of that, I don't think the media will be a problem in this case.

So if you will, your time is your own.

Please fill out the questionnaires and the Sheriff will take them up and then you are free to go. So if you need to talk to me, start here at the Texas flag and line up along the

```
wall so we can talk to you individually.
                        THE COURT: Parties agree on excusing
    Detective Curtis, No. 1387?
                       MR. SHOOK: Yes.
                       MS. BUSBEE: Yes.
                        THE COURT: Do you have your card? No.
    404 Vita Romero.
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
                       THE COURT: What can I do for you?
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm disabled.
10
                       THE COURT: I can see that.
11
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It's supposed to be
12
    on file down here, but they keep sending me these things.
13
                       THE COURT: We want you to serve on a
14
    jury.
15
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: So even if I'm sick?
16
                       THE COURT: Sick and disabled are two
17
    different things. Are you --
18
19
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm epilepsy.
                       THE COURT: Are you telling me you simply
20
    can't make it through a two-week trial physically?
21
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I guess, I guess, I
22
23
    guess.
                       THE COURT: We have to make
24
    accommodations. We want you to serve. If you tell me I
25
```

```
physically cannot make it through a two-week trial, then I
    understand. I know you don't want to.
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My husband have to be
    with me.
                        THE COURT: Do you work, sir?
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah.
                       THE COURT: That causes a completely
    different problem.
                       MS. BUSBEE: We can agreed.
                       MR. SHOOK: Agree.
10
11
                       THE COURT: The attorneys have agreed to
                 Thank you, ma'am. No. 1824, Michael Klein.
    excuse her.
12
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My father was
13
    murdered and there was no way that I would be able to serve
14
15
    as a juror.
                       MS. BUSBEE: Agree.
16
                       MR. SHOOK:
17
                                   Agree.
                       THE COURT:
                                   Thank you, sir. The parties
18
    have agreed. No. 2494, Tamera George.
19
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm a full-time
20
    student.
21
                       THE COURT: Where?
22
23
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: At Mountain View
    College.
24
                       THE COURT: Are you enrolled this fall?
25
```

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
    transferring to UTA.
                       THE COURT: Any problem?
                       MS. BUSBEE: No.
                       MR. SHOOK: No.
                       THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am.
                                                       No. 1041,
    Lashondria Sheppard.
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Today I have to pick
    up my daughter by 3:00.
                       THE COURT: No problem. Just fill out
10
    the questionnaire and you are free to go. Number --
11
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I would have a
12
    medical excuse.
13
                       THE COURT: No. 20, Janet Nathan.
14
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I would have a
15
    medical excuse by Wednesday morning. I took early
16
    retirement, so I wouldn't have to get up and be at any
17
    particular time. I'm type 2 diabetic and stress sends my
18
    blood sugar up.
19
                       MS. BUSBEE: We agree.
20
                       MR. SHOOK:
                                   Agree.
21
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Do I need a letter
22
    from the doctor?
23
                       THE COURT: No. They have agreed on you.
24
25
   No. 505, David Maggard.
```

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I live in Tarrant
    County.
                        THE COURT: Not qualified.
                        MS. BUSBEE: The bad news is you have to
    go over to Tarrant County now.
                        THE COURT: No. 1822, Jin Park.
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm going to take an
    overseas trip and I have airline tickets June 7 and come
    here after nine months.
10
                        THE COURT:
                                    Be gone nine months.
                       MS. BUSBEE: Agree.
11
                       MR. SHOOK: Agree.
12
                       THE COURT: Thank you. The parties have
13
14
    agreed. You are free to qo. Number?
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm going to nursing
15
    school.
16
                       THE COURT: No. 1578, Oloyede.
17
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm going to nursing
18
    school.
19
20
                       THE COURT: Will you be a full-time
    student this fall?
21
22
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
23
                       MS. BUSBEE: Fine.
24
                       MR. D'AMORE: Fine.
25
                       THE COURT: No. 2815, Melia Emanuel.
```

```
Yes, ma'am? You have it filled out. You have been
    convicted of a felony?
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Shoplifting 16 years
    ago.
                        THE COURT: Final conviction?
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sixteen years ago,
    yeah.
                        THE COURT: Was it a final conviction for
    shoplifting?
10
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: What do you mean by
    that?
11
12
                        THE COURT: Did you go to jail?
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I paid.
13
14
                       MS. BUSBEE: We can agree.
15
                       MR. SHOOK: That's fine.
16
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Six months'
    probation.
17
                       MS. BUSBEE: We'll agree. On here it's
18
    too iffy.
19
20
                       THE COURT:
                                   Thank you. They have agreed.
    You are free to go. No. 2183, Stephen Dumaine. Yes?
21
22
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I am moving to Collin
    County.
23
24
                       THE COURT: When?
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have a contract on
25
```

```
a house and it closes next month.
                       THE COURT: Close enough. Thank you,
    sir. You are not qualified. No. 953, Daryl Coleman. Yes?
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm moving to New
    Orleans in two weeks.
                       THE COURT: That will get it. No. 1758,
    Deitrich Armstrong.
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I feel like I
    wouldn't be able to do it because my sister was murdered.
                       MR. SHOOK: Your sister was murdered?
10
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Uh-huh.
11
                       MR. SHOOK: That's fine. We'll agree.
12
                       MS. BUSBEE: Yes.
13
                      THE COURT: We'll find another case for
14
    you, not this one. They have agreed you can go. No. 164,
15
    Tracy Cook. Yes, ma'am?
16
17
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm going to be
    moving to Denton County. I will be closing on my house on
18
    the 15th of next month.
19
                       THE COURT: That will work. You are
20
    excused. No. 2159, Jalyn Zeiser. You are moving?
21
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
22
                       THE COURT:
23
                                   Where?
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Frisco. We were
24
   there today. Do you want our home warrant thing? I have it
25
```

with me. THE COURT: You were sworn to tell the truth. You are not qualified, so you are free to go. No. 2078, Matthew Butler. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was convicted of burglary of a building when I was 18. THE COURT: Did you serve probation? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. THE COURT: Go to the penitentiary? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. I think it was 10 adjudicated probation. 11 MS. BUSBEE: What year was that? 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: '83. 13 14 THE COURT: So you want to do a record check or fill it out? 15 MS. BUSBEE: Have him fill out the 16 questionnaire. 17 18 THE COURT: Highlight that and disclose it on your questionnaire. Number --19 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: You got me for my last case in Dallas County, but it's too late. 21 THE COURT: No. 107 Donna Waller. Moving 22 to Tarrant County. 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah. My house is 24 supposed to be done in July and I'll be moving in August. 25

```
THE COURT: Very good. You are
    dismissed.
               No. 2904, Victoria Mejia.
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm moving.
                       THE COURT: To where?
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: To New York.
                       THE COURT: Have a good time. No. 1195,
    Freeman Graqq.
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have glaucoma and I
    can't read small print.
                       THE COURT: Have you tried looking at the
10
    questionnaire?
11
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It has to be pretty
12
    big for me to read it. No, I cannot read it. I cannot read
13
    it.
14
                       MS. BUSBEE: Agree.
15
                       MR. WIRSKYE: Agree.
16
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I can't read that
17
    small print. I can read that line there, probably. I have
18
    a magnifying thing at home that I use.
19
                       THE COURT: The parties have agreed to
20
    excuse you, sir. You are free to go. No. 2563, Paula
21
    Enstrom.
22
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm moving to San
23
24
    Francisco in the middle of August.
25
                       THE COURT: Can't use you.
```

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Won't be here. MS. BUSBEE: Yes. MR. SHOOK: Yes. THE COURT: Number --PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Does this have anything to do with it? THE COURT: No. You are fine. Fill it out. Bondsman. No. 1937, Larry Hackney. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't feel that I could make a judgment on my -- on a death penalty. I just 10 don't believe in it. I mean, I just don't think I could. 11 12 MS. BUSBEE: You know, I know he should 13 fill in the questionnaire, but if he's going to put it on there let's agree and save him the trouble. 14 15 MR. SHOOK: We can agree. THE COURT: Okay, sir. Maybe we can find 16 another case for you. No. 636, Miranda Baker. Yes, ma'am? 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Full-time student in 18 the fall and spring. 19 20 THE COURT: Where do you go to school? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Richland College. 21 22 THE COURT: Exemption. Any questions? MS. BUSBEE: No. 23 MR. SHOOK: No. 24 25 THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am. You are

```
excused. No. 1744, Heather Cross.
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My house is for sale
    and we'll be moving to Waxahachie.
                        THE COURT: Ellis County?
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
                        THE COURT: No. 2390, Jennifer Anderson.
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: We've signed a
    contract off of our house. I'm moving. I'm going to be
    doing some consulting work, but from a travel trailer and I
    don't know whether you allow that. I don't mind filling it
10
11
    out, but we're moving to --
12
                       MR. SHOOK: You are moving to another
    county?
13
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. We're moving to
14
    the coast.
15
                       THE COURT: Your residence will be down
16
    there?
17
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Smithpoint
18
    (phonetic), yes.
19
20
                       THE COURT: They've agreed. Thank you,
    ma'am. No. 2377, Valerie King.
21
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Had this been over
22
    the summer, I would be able to serve, but I'm trying to get
23
    into medical school this year, so I'm going to be a
24
    full-time student during the academic year.
25
```

```
THE COURT: Ouestions?
                        MS. BUSBEE: No.
                        THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am. We'll let
    you claim your exemption.
                        THE COURT: Number -- Malone, 567, Mary
    Malone.
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My problem is I
    didn't know we had to fill out questions and I didn't bring
    my reading glasses. Other than that, no problem.
    see how to fill out the questions. That's the only problem
10
    that I have.
11
                       MS. BUSBEE: Let her go.
12
13
                       MR. SHOOK:
                                   Agreed.
                        THE COURT:
                                   They have agreed to let you
14
    go. You don't have to fill it out.
15
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was found guilty.
16
                       THE COURT: No. 1079, Mr. Lane Lucas.
17
    You were saying that you were found quilty of --
18
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Theft over $750,
19
    embezzlement, '92. I served a two-year probation, 120 hours
20
    community service.
21
22
                       THE COURT: Do you know if it was
    straight or deferred?
23
24
                                           Straight.
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
25
                       MS. BUSBEE: Excuse him?
```

MR. SHOOK: Yes. THE COURT: Parties have agreed, sir. No. 1576, Shannon Edwards. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm technically moving out of Texas. I'm a student in Missouri, so I will be in Missouri. THE COURT: You have a qualification, an exemption. I'll go for the out of state. Any questions? MS. BUSBEE: No. MR. SHOOK: No. 10 THE COURT: No. 1592, Ms. Foto. 11 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: THE COURT: Not a citizen and school. 13 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. THE COURT: I believe we can let you go. 15 Qualifications. No. 1720, Kara Devening. 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I brought a notice 17 and the -- I know it's far off, but I'm undergoing fertility 18 treatment and I'm having surgery on my uterus next week and 19 starting the process of in vitro. 20 21 MS. BUSBEE: We agree. MR. SHOOK: Agree. 22 23 THE COURT: They've already agreed. 24 THE COURT: No. 2667, David Holquin. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm moving to Denton 25

County. THE COURT: By the end of the month? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: House is sold. THE COURT: House is sold. Thank you. No. 795, James Weber. Yes? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I wasn't understanding what you were saying when you said a pending case. I have a pending DWI. THE COURT: It says pending for theft or any felony. 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: And this is a 11 misdemeanor. 12 THE COURT: Be sure you put that on your 13 questionnaire, please, sir. No. 1542, Corinne Chamberlin. 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm a resident of 15 Denton County now. I just left the title company to come 16 17 here. THE COURT: All right. You are not 18 qualified. We'll get you a case up in Denton County. Good 19 luck. No. 509, Franco Williams. 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have enrolled and 21 attending Amberton University on a full-time basis and the 22 week of before Thanksgiving I'm taking my finals to get my 23 degree. 24 25 THE COURT: Full-time student. You are

```
claiming your exemption. Any questions?
                        MS. BUSBEE: No.
                        THE COURT: You are free to go. No. 31,
    Louis Arnemann.
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm being transferred
    out of the state with my employer, American Airlines. June
    13 is my last day in Dallas, actually in Texas.
                        THE COURT: All right. At least you have
    a job.
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: On the beach in
10
    Miami.
11
12
                        THE COURT: No. 1070, Alejandro Deanda.
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm a full-time
13
    student right now. I'm on break, but by August I'm going to
14
    be full time.
15
16
                       THE COURT: Any questions?
                       MS. BUSBEE: No.
17
                       MR. WIRSKYE: No.
18
19
                       THE COURT: Thank you, sir. No. 1968,
    David Reznik.
20
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Eight years ago I had
21
    a series of hot checks, spent a couple of nights in jail,
22
23
    and paid restitution.
                       THE COURT: Did you go before a judge?
24
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
25
```

THE COURT: Found quilty? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Pled guilty. THE COURT: Plead guilty and found guilty? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was found guilty and paid the fine and restitutions. MS. BUSBEE: I don't have any problem with excusing him. MR. WIRSKYE: We agree. 10 THE COURT: Thank you, sir. You are free to go. No. 1311, Lino Casas. 11 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm not speaking one hundred percent English and I don't know how to write and 13 read. 14 THE COURT: Any questions? 15 16 MS. BUSBEE: No. 17 MR. WIRSKYE: No questions. THE COURT: Thank you, sir, you are free 18 to go. No. 1052, John Jillson. 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have two children 20 and when my wife goes to work, I take care of my kids. I 21 have no child care provider. I have a five year old and 15 22 month old. 23 24 THE COURT: What do you do in the day? 25 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I work afternoons on

```
my days off when she flies the second half of each month, I
    watch my children.
                        THE COURT: Any questions?
                       MR. WIRSKYE: No questions.
                        THE COURT: Thank you, sir. We'll let
    you go. No. 2320, Wade Brooks.
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm currently
    building a new home in Denton County.
                       THE COURT: Building a home?
10
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
                       THE COURT: Moving at the end of the
11
    summer?
12
13
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir. It should
    be October, the first of October.
14
                       THE COURT: Any questions?
15
                       MS. BUSBEE: No.
16
17
                       MR. WIRSKYE: No.
18
                       THE COURT: They have agreed. We will
    let you go. No. 2348, Ms. Ieong. Yes, ma'am?
19
20
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Because my education
    is really low, my English is poor. I don't understand the
21
    question and write.
22
23
                       MS. BUSBEE:
                                    Okay.
24
                       MR. SHOOK: Okay.
25
                       THE COURT: They have agreed to let you
```

No. 1011, Ms. Ko? go. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm sorry, English is my second. I can't read and I can't write. THE COURT: You can't make any of that out? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Just only the basics. THE COURT: Just your name and address? MR. SHOOK: We can agree. THE COURT: They are not going to make you fill it out. 10 You are free to go. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: So I can go? 11 THE COURT: Yes, ma'am. Number No. 26, 12 Dianne Goode. 13 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm really worried about my participation, because I have hearing loss. 15 didn't catch everything you said. I notice there's a spot 16 in the very back where you can fill in if you have a 17 handIcap. And I will be glad to do the questionnaire, but 18 I'm really shaky on it. 19 MS. BUSBEE: We'll agree. 20 MR. SHOOK: Agree. 21 22 THE COURT: You are free to go. No. 838, Kevin Thurmaan. 23 24 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Right now it's one of two problems. One of them is I don't have prescription 25

```
eyeglasses, so I can't really read right now. And the other
reason is I'm on a new medication. My two different types
of medication, one is called Abillified (phonetic) and the
other one is called -- starts with a B-I, can't pronounce
it. And it makes my vision blurry, so I can't --
                   THE COURT: We can't have blurry vision.
We have agreed to let you go.
                   MS. BUSBEE: Agree.
                   MR. SHOOK: Agree.
                   THE COURT: No. 1479, Mr. Anthony Ruffu.
Yes, what can I do for you?
                   PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Several months ago,
five or six, I was severely attacked from behind and beaten
in the face about 15 blows by a young African-American and I
don't know if that is -- I don't -- I'm not happy about it.
                   MR. WIRSKYE: Agreed.
                   THE COURT: I don't believe there's a
case you need to hear and the parties have agreed to excuse
you. You are free to go. No. 962, Ramon Esquivel.
                   PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I just read this in
the back and it says I'm not a citizen yet.
                   THE COURT: Not a citizen yet. We can't
use you yet. Become a citizen and come back, okay?
                  PROSPECTIVE JUROR: All right.
                  THE COURT: No. 2239, Haruno Bowdoin.
```

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Yes, ma'am? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I cannot fill out all this paper because I have problem with the language. I can speak a little bit, but I don't know much about murder. THE COURT: You have tried and the parties have agreed to excuse you. Thank you. You are free to go. No. 205, Reginald Durley. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. I don't feel I can give a verdict in somebody's death. I don't believe it. MS. BUSBEE: Like I said before, we might 10 as well, because he's going to be a 4 or 5. 11 THE COURT: He's a 4 or 5. So there's no 12 way that you can be fair in this case? 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It will be in my mind 14 that I sentence somebody to death and I live with it. 15 THE COURT: You agree? 16 MS. BUSBEE: Yes. 17 THE COURT: Any questions? 18 19 MR. SHOOK: No. THE COURT: They will let you go. 20 851, Mr. Larry Burns. 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My education won't 22 And for my beliefs, sending a person allow me to do this. 23 to the death penalty, I don't feel comfortable doing that. 24 25 THE COURT: I have a whole room of people

```
that don't feel comfortable.
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My education won't
    allow me to do this because some of the questions I have
    problems with spelling, reading, and writing, so that's
    going to be a big problem in that area. And just along with
    that, my feeling of sending somebody down there, I couldn't.
    So I'm just being honest with y'all.
                        THE COURT: Mr. Sanchez, any questions?
                       MR. SANCHEZ: No.
10
                       MR. WIRSKYE: Agree.
                       THE COURT: All right, sir. You are free
11
    to go. No. 1260, Ms. Pescador.
12
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Could you say again,
13
    please? Talk loud. I can't put down what I want to say. I
14
15
    don't know how to spell.
16
                       THE COURT: And what is your native
    language?
17
18
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                           Japanese.
                       MS. BUSBEE: Agreed.
19
                       MR. SHOOK: Agreed.
20
                                   The parties have agreed.
21
                       THE COURT:
    can go. No. 1276, Mr. Marco Salais.
22
23
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm a Dallas police
    officer.
24
25
                       THE COURT:
                                   So?
```

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: And I also am in the
    process of looking for an apartment in Rockwall.
                        THE COURT: So?
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's the only thing
    that I wanted to talk to you about.
                        MR. SHOOK: We can agree.
                        THE COURT: I'm not going to let you off,
    but they are.
                        MR. WIRSKYE: I know him, Your Honor.
10
                        THE COURT: Thank you, sir. No. 869,
    Mr. Pedro Cruz.
11
12
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't speak
    English.
14
                       THE COURT: Are you -- did you try to
    read this?
15
16
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I tried, but I can't
    figure it out.
17
                       THE COURT: Any questions?
18
19
                       MR. SHOOK: We can agree.
20
                       MS. BUSBEE: No, sir.
                       THE COURT: They have agreed to let you
    go. No. 1698, Reginald Turknett.
22
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It's against my
23
   religion.
24
25
                       THE COURT: What religion?
```

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Church of Christ.

THE COURT: Questions?

MS. BUSBEE: No.

MR. SHOOK: No.

THE COURT: No way you can do this case?

MS. BUSBEE: Agree.

MR. SHOOK: Agree.

THE COURT: All right. They will let you off the hook. No. 581, Mr. Leslie Shoots. You could never, even if you could read this, you could never return a verdict that would assessing a death penalty in any circumstances?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I can read it, but I don't feel comfortable placing myself in that condition to condemn or judge. I'm struggling answering these questions. I'm really in a problem.

MS. BUSBEE: What we said previously about this matter, we can agree, because it won't make any difference based on our agreement with the State.

THE COURT: All right. They are going to agree to let you go. No. 748, Sharon Vaca. Yes, ma'am?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My husband is going to have major surgery. He has a testicular tumor next month and he's going to have equilibrium problems for about three months.

THE COURT: Husband having surgery. He' going to be down for three months? We're not going to be interviewing people before August. I want you to put that on your questionnaire and fill it out. And if you get a call and there's a problem when you get the call to come back down, let us know at that time. Okay?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay. Thank you.

THE COURT: No. 2274, Mr. Gulley.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Two things, number one, I'm with the Dallas Morning News and we did cover this in the newspaper when it happened.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Yes. Do you believe everything that's in the newspaper? You are under oath now.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have to say yes because I work for the Dallas Morning News. I have to say yes, I believe in our product. But even beyond that, second thing is, in fact, I'm working out a traffic ticket with the City of Carrollton.

THE COURT: Traffic tickets? No problem. Finish that up for me.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: No. 931, Mr. Manuel Flores.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't know if this has anything to do, but I went to -- we went to elementary school.

```
THE COURT: We did. I haven't seen you
     in 30 years.
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Right. Lakewood
    Elementary.
                        THE COURT: Absolutely. I have not seen
    you in 30 years.
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: You know my brother,
    Danny.
                        THE COURT: Yes.
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: So I don't know if
10
    that --
11
12
                        THE COURT: They need to know that. It
    doesn't bother me.
13
14
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: We went to elementary
    school together.
15
16
                       MS. BUSBEE: So you have got some good
    stories. Put those in that questionnaire.
17
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: He is different than
18
    7th grade right now.
19
                       MS. BUSBEE: Wouldn't affect you in the
20
    trial. He's a neutral party.
21
22
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: If that's okay with
    you.
23
24
                       THE COURT:
                                   They need to know that you
    are not going to make a decision on the evidence based on
25
```

```
the fact that you and I went to school together 30 years
    ago.
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I didn't know if that
    was /--
                        THE COURT: We appreciate you saying
    hello and, if you would, fill that out for us. No. 2556,
    Mr. Ernie Brown. Yes? What can I do for you?
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay. I have kids
    under ten. You were saying if you have a child under ten
    that you can't be exempt.
10
11
                        THE COURT: Where do you work?
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't work.
12
    don't have a job right now.
13
                       THE COURT:
14
                                    That's pretty thin,
    Mr. Brown. Who has them right now?
15
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My mama watch them
16
    for me, so I can come down here.
17
18
                       MS. BUSBEE: That's an exemption.
19
                       MR. WIRSKYE: You are the soul caretaker
    of those children?
20
21
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
22
                       MR. WIRSKYE: And they are under ten?
23
                       THE COURT: They are going to let you
    claim your exemption. You are free to go. Number --
24
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm not sure if I'm
25
```

```
part of Dallas County. I tried to vote last November and
    they told me I was part of Collin County.
                        THE COURT: No. 173, Ms. Radon.
    Haverwoods (phonetic) up in Dallas, 75297 (phonetic).
                                                            So
    did you say it was Denton County?
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: They told me it was
    Collin.
                        THE COURT: City of Dallas.
                       MS. BUSBEE: That's possible.
10
                       THE COURT: It's possible.
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I would love to stay.
11
                       THE COURT: Where do you pay your taxes?
12
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My taxes?
13
                       THE COURT: Yes. You don't pay property
14
15
    taxes. You live in an apartment?
16
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Right.
17
                       MS. BUSBEE: Where do you send your
    registration for your car?
18
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I just bought a new
19
    car, I'm sorry.
20
                       THE COURT: Put it on the questionnaire
21
    and we'll check it with the map.
22
23
                       MR. SHOOK: We can probably check it
    right now.
24
25
                       THE COURT: Are you registered to vote?
```

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. THE COURT: Where do you vote? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: They told me Collin County. THE COURT: Okay. Probably want to figure out what county. They are going to let you go. Thank you. Number --PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm having cataract surgery. I can't see well. THE COURT: No. 1524, Ms. Nevaquaya. You 10 11 are having cataract surgery in two weeks? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Three weeks. I can 12 see once I have my surgery. I can't see to make out some of 13 the lines. 14 THE COURT: You are having a problem 15 keeping between the lines? 16 17 MS. BUSBEE: We've let other people go. I don't have any problem with it. 18 19 MR. WIRSKYE: Let her go. THE COURT: They are going to let you go. 20 No. 2289, Stephen York. Yes? 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: When I was 18 I did 22 something young and foolish and I got convicted of it and it 23 was pot smoking. I took it very serious and I take it very 24 serious now. 25

THE COURT: Just put it on your questionnaire. They need to know that. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Do you put it down here for a conviction of a felony? THE COURT: It probably wasn't a felony. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't know. MS. BUSBEE: What year was it? THE COURT: 1970. Just write it on the questionnaire. 10 MS. BUSBEE: We didn't have deferred back then. 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm ashamed to talk 12 about it now. It's not considered serious now. It's a very 13 small crime now. 14 15 THE COURT: Just put it in there that you were convicted of marijuana. No. 2952, West, yes, ma'am. 16 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm a simple person and I stay at home. I go to work and I'm not strong. 18 That's not me. I don't have good answers to that. I don't 19 have a mind for it, in other words. It would take me 20 forever just to sit there and fill this out and put on there 21 what y'all may want to hear. It ain't going to work with 22 I'm not the type of person, I'm just not -- I'm sorry. 23 24 MS. BUSBEE: Let's not agree to people that are marginal. 25

```
MS. BUSBEE: I read my Bible and I pray.
                       THE COURT: You are going to have to fill
    this out, okay?
                     It's part of the program. Number --
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I filled out.
                       THE COURT: No. 680, Ms. Sosbe.
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: This tells about a
    medication that I have.
                       THE COURT: Put it on your questionnaire.
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.
                                                  That's all I
    need to do. You don't need a copy of this?
10
                       THE COURT: Staple it to it if you want
11
    to and put it in there. No. 2171, Mr. Bailey.
12
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I can't do this.
13
                                                              Ι
    don't believe in the death sentencing at all under any
14
15
    circumstances. The Bible --
                       THE COURT: I need you to finish filling
16
    this out, please, sir. No. -- Mr. Huynh, No. 1035. .
17
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Because I'm not
18
   understanding this well, that's why I can't --
19
                       THE COURT: They have agreed to excuse
20
   you. You are free to go.
21
22
                            [End of Volume]
23
```

24

STATE OF TEXAS

COUNTY OF DALLAS

I, NANCY BREWER, Official Court Reporter for the 283rd Judicial District Court, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing constitutes a true and correct transcription of all portions of evidence and other proceedings requested in writing by counsel for the parties to be included in this volume of the Reporter's Record, in the above-styled and numbered cause, all of which occurred in open court or in chambers and were reported by me.

NANCY BREWER, CSR, NO. 5759
Expiration Date: 12-31-04
Official Reporter, 283rd JDC
Frank Crowley Crts. Bldg. LB33
133 No. Industrial Blvd.
Dallas, TX 75207
(214)653-5863

#### REPORTER'S RECORD

74851

# VOLUME 7 OF 6 VOLUMES

TRIAL COURT CAUSE NO. F01-00328-T

STATE OF TEXAS \* IN THE DISTRICT COURT

VS. \* DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS

PATRICK HENRY MURPHY, JR. \* 283RD DISTRICT COURT

\*\*\*\*\*\*

INDIVIDUAL VOIR DIRE

\*\*\*\*\*\*

FILED IN

MAR 9 - 20C4

Troy C. Bennett, Jr., Clerk

On the 28th day of August 2003, the following proceedings came on to be heard in the above-entitled and numbered cause before the Honorable Vickers L. Cunningham, Sr., Judge Presiding, held in Dallas, Dallas County, Texas.

Proceedings reported by machine shorthand.

**ORIGINAL** 

25

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

## APPEARANCES

## APPEARING FOR THE STATE

Mr. Toby Shook
SBOT NO. 18293250
And
Mr. Bill Wirskye
SBOT NO. 00788696
Assistant District Attorneys
133 No. Industrial Blvd.
Dallas, Texas 75207

## APPEARING FOR THE DEFENDANT

Phone: 214/653-3600

Ms. Brook Busbee Attorney at Law SBOT: 03488000 703 McKinney Ave. Ste. 312 Dallas, TX 75202 214/754-9090

Mr. Juan Sanchez Attorney at Law SBOT: 00791599 5630 Yale Blvd. Dallas, TX 75206 214/365-0700

25

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

_					
[	DDOGD	<b>ECTIVE</b> .TIE	OD INDEX		
-1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR INDEX				
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR	CRT	<u>STATE</u>	DEFENSE	VOL.
3	Christopher O'Neal	5	7		7
4	Carole Lawson	8	10	33	7
5	David Shannon	56	58	88	7
6	Barbara Holcombe	97	99	132	7
7	Eugene Peterson	138	140		7
8	Jill Ann Ervin	153	155		7
9					
10					•

## PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: Cause No. F01-00328, what

says the State?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SHOOK: State's ready.

THE COURT: What says the defense?

MS. BUSBEE: For the purpose of picking a

jury, Your Honor, we're ready.

THE COURT: Arraign the defendant.

MR. SHOOK: "True bill of Indictment, by the name and by the authority of the State of Texas, the Grand Jury of Dallas County, State of Texas, duly organized at the January Term AD 2001 of the 282nd Judicial District Court, Dallas County, in said Court at said term do present that one Patrick Henry Murphy, Jr.;" -- is that your name?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

of December AD 2000, in the County of Dallas and said state did unlawfully then and there knowingly and intentionally cause the death of Aubrey Hawkins, an individual, hereinafter called the deceased, by shooting the said deceased with a firearm, a deadly weapon, and the said deceased was a peace officer, namely, City of Irving police officer, then and there acting in the lawful discharge of an official duty and the said defendant then and there knew the said deceased to be a peace officer and further unlawfully

then and there intentionally caused the death of Aubrey Hawkins, an individual, hereinafter called the deceased, by shooting the said deceased with a firearm, a deadly weapon, and defendant was then and there in the course of committing and attempting to commit the offense of robbery of Wesley Ferris, against the peace and dignity of the State, Bill Hill, Criminal District Attorney of Dallas County, Texas, and signed by the foreman of the Grand Jury." THE COURT: Mr. Murphy, how do you plead to the indictment as presented to this Court? 10 THE DEFENDANT: Not guilty. 11 THE COURT: Sheriff, would you ask 12 Mr. O'Neil to come in. 13 14 [Prospective juror in] THE COURT: Good morning, sir. 15 How are you? 16 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm just fine, thank How are you doing? 18 you. 19 THE COURT: You are Christopher Scott O'Neil? 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Correct. 21 THE COURT: Have you had a chance to 22 review the orientation guide that I provided for you? 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's right. 24 25 THE COURT: I'm not going to go outside

```
of that very much other than to ask you do you have some
    understanding of the law that we're going to be talking
    about here today?
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                            Yes, sir.
                        THE COURT: Give you an outline of the
    time frame we're going to be considering in this matter, do
    you have any issues as far as being able to give the Court
    two weeks of time beginning on November 10th?
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Actually I do.
    tried to explain this. Tuesday and Thursday -- at the time
10
    of the first screening, I wasn't in school. I wasn't going
11
    to be. And now I have class Tuesdays and Thursdays. So --
12
13
                       THE COURT: And where will you be
    attending school?
14
15
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Richland.
                       THE COURT: Is this full-time basis or
16
17
    part-time?
18
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Part-time.
19
                       THE COURT: What time are your classes?
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It's going to be from
20
    about 10:00 to 2:00. Actually, I have to go today to
21
    finalize that.
22
23
                       THE COURT: 10:00 to 2:00?
24
                       MR. SHOOK: Could I ask just a couple of
    questions?
25
```

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

## **DIRECT EXAMINATION**

## BY MR. SHOOK:

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. How many classes are you taking?
- A. Three classes.
- Q. Three? Okay. And how many hours credit would that be?
  - A. Nine hours.
- Q. And this is all going towards a degree, I take it?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. What kind?
  - A. Business, general business.
- Q. And you are going to also be working full-time during this period?
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. The trial will be a couple of weeks-period, I guess, in November, which would be getting close to finals. Obviously, if you were asked to miss two weeks, to be down here for two weeks, that would be four class periods you would have to miss?
  - A. Correct.
- Q. Which, obviously, would be pretty bit of a hardship. I went to college, but Mr. Wirskye didn't go to many classes and make it. Would that be something that's

going to really weigh on your mind since you are enrolled and working towards a degree, if you are placed on a jury and you had to miss classes? Α. I believe so. MR. SHOOK: We can agree, then, Judge. THE COURT: Mr. O'Neil, I appreciate you taking time to fill out the questionnaire and respond to the first jury call. As you said, your circumstances changed. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah, they did. 10 THE COURT: And we all recognize the importance of education and we want your full attention, if 11 you were going to be on this case. And the parties have 12 agreed to excuse you at this time. 13 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you very much. 15 THE COURT: Thank you, sir. 16 [Prospective juror out] 17 THE COURT: Sheriff, may we have Carol 18 Margaret Lawson. 19 [Prospective juror in] 20 THE COURT: Good morning, Ms. Lawson, how are you? 21 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning. Fine, thank you. 23 24 THE COURT: You brought your reading material. And as the orientation guide said, we didn't know 25

if we're going to talk to someone for a few minutes or a few hours. So a person was a few minutes, the first one this morning, but we appreciate you coming down. Did you have an opportunity read --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I didn't.

THE COURT: You weren't reading?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I started reading the State's witness list.

THE COURT: So you didn't have time to read the orientation guide?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir.

THE COURT: It will shorten this up, if you take a minute and look through that real quickly and we'll be quiet.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: [Prospective juror complies.] Okay.

THE COURT: Ms. Lawson, I know you had just a few minutes to briefly look through that and that gives you an idea of what we're going to be discussing this morning.

First question I have for you is this trial is scheduled to begin with testimony beginning on November 10th, last approximately two weeks. Is there any major problem that you would not be able to serve this Court for that period of time?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Um, I think that

THE COURT: We'll be through way before Thanksgiving week. That is the objective. We don't want to mess with anybody's holiday. All right? Remember that you are under oath. If you don't understand any of the questions, just say, I don't understand. We're not trying to trip you up or trick you or anything else. It's a complicated process and the lawyers will be talking to you to get you to understand the law and then we'll answer any questions that you have.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.

THE COURT: With that I'll turn it over to Mr. Shook. You may inquire.

MR. SHOOK: May it please the Court.

#### MARGARET LAWSON,

having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

#### **DIRECT EXAMINATION**

#### BY MR. SHOOK:

would be fine.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Ms. Lawson, my name is Toby Shook. I'm one of the prosecutors. I'll be asking questions on behalf of the State today. And as the Judge has told you, you know, there's not any right or wrong answers to any of our questions. We just want your honest opinions.

We appreciate you taking the time, I guess it was back in May, to fill out this questionnaire. I know it was quite lengthy. There was some personal information and believe it or not, it actually does save you some time. But it was quite informative.

What I'll do today is we'll ask some questions from the questionnaire and follow up on a few things. We're going to talk a lot about capital murder, the death penalty, want to know how you feel about it. We're going to go over the law in these types of cases and ask you how you feel about different laws. But the bottom line is, we just want your honest opinions. We know most people would rather be somewhere else, obviously, but most people like yourself understand your civic duty.

Have you -- I don't believe that you have ever been on a jury before?

A. No.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Have you been called down to jury duty?
- A. Yes.
- Q. You know from that experience, then, this is a lot different?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. We do this individual interview, so to speak.

  I think it sometimes intimidates some people, because you
  feel like you are the one on trial when you are on the

witness stand. We all recognize that. And I know we can tell you to relax. It's kind of hard to do. But just try your best. We kind of warm up. People get more comfortable as we go along. But we understand how it's a little intimidating to be up there. Okay?

A. Yes.

Q. Let me -- this is background information. You

- Q. Let me -- this is background information. You grew up here in Texas. Looks like you spent your first years growing up in the Houston area?
  - A. Uh-huh, right.
  - Q. And you went to the University of Texas?
  - A. Uh-huh.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. And then the last few years you have been here in Dallas?
  - A. Correct.
  - Q. What brought you to Dallas?
  - A. My husband's job.
  - Q. And you have lived here for how long now?
  - A. Nine to ten years.
- Q. Okay. Let me -- you put on the questionnaire that you had several friends that are attorneys?
  - A. Uh-huh.
  - Q. What type of law do they practice?
- A. You know, I don't know. We have real estate attorney friends and, you know, I don't know if we have any

criminal --

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. None that you know of, then?
- A. None that I know of.
- Q. Sometimes we ask that because if someone is a close friend of a criminal attorney or prosecutor, then we want to know what kind of war stories they've heard and that sort of thing. But you don't have that situation.

You know from talking with the Judge when you were first brought down, that this is a capital murder case and one in which the State is seeking the death penalty. And there was a lot of questions about the death penalty and how you feel about it on the questionnaire and, obviously, we're going to follow up on that. You probably had more time to think about it since that time.

- A. Yeah.
- Q. So I want to ask you several questions about that. You put on your questionnaire that you favor it as a law. Do you still feel that way?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Just tell us in your own reasons or your own words why you favor the death penalty, why you think it's an appropriate punishment in certain cases.
- A. Um, well, I just feel like it's the law of the land, first of all, and that we need to abide by it.
  - Q. Is it something that you have always believed

in as you grew up?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

- A. Yes.
- Q. Do you think it's a just sentence in certain types of cases?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. When you think of a death penalty case, what types of cases come to mind?
- A. Um, murder, um, and I'm very compassionate toward children, so that -- I mean, I don't know if that would ever warrant --
- Q. A lot of people tell us that. We ask questions sometimes if you were the Governor of Texas and could decide what laws would be death, they will bring up certain murder cases and sometimes I ask if there was some other case other than murder, usually people say if you injure a child severely.

In Texas, right now the only cases reserved for the death penalty are murder cases and then only certain types of murder cases, one of those involving the death of a child under the age of six. But that's something a lot of the jurors tell us.

Have there been any cases that you followed in the media that you thought were appropriate for the death penalty?

A. Um, you know, my recollection is not that --

is not that good. I do tend to read the newspaper a lot and follow certain cases, but I just cannot specifically say.

- Q. We asked one question, if you thought some crimes, just on the facts of the crime itself, might call for the death penalty and the example you used was the father that killed his daughters while his wife was on the phone. And that's a pretty infamous case.
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. That was the Bataglia case, I believe.
  - A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. And you felt that was the type of case, obviously, involving children as victims.
  - A. Right.
- Q. In Texas, the death penalty is reserved for intentional killings, not an accident, not self-defense. An intentional murder during the course of certain circumstances or aggravating facts. We have a lot of brutal murders that could be prosecuted and get a life sentence, but you can't get the death penalty.

I could pull a gun out, shoot Mr. Wirskye in the head because I didn't like his tie, and I could laugh about it. It's a brutal killing, but I couldn't get the death penalty.

To get the death penalty, you have to commit a murder during the course of a felony. If I go down

and rob the 7-Eleven and shoot the clerk, if I go break into someone's home and murder someone in the home, if I kidnap someone, if I murder someone during the course of a rape, those types of felonies, that could be a death penalty case.

- A. Okay. I have a question. So -- but if your intention to kill him was premeditated, would that be --
  - Q. It would not.
  - A. Okay.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. And states differ. But the Supreme Court has left some guidelines. They can't -- and what they have basically in certain terms have said, look, you can't have it for every murder case. You have to have some guidelines. And Texas has limited it just to these types of cases. And sometimes that's fair and sometimes it's not.

I mean, the example we get the most is, I believe you talked about, is the Timothy Richardson case, the man that killed his wife --

- A. Uh-huh. I'm familiar with that.
- Q. -- in Park Cities was not a death penalty case, because -- a brutal killing, horrible killing, but he doesn't commit it during the course of a felony or that sort of a thing, but got a life sentence or equivalent of one, but didn't get a death penalty.

Other types of crimes, the murder of a child under the age of six, could be a death penalty case.

They chose that age for whatever reasons. Someone that murdered someone for money, like a hitman situation, could be a death penalty case. Murder of specific victims, such as a police officer on duty or a fireman on duty or a prison guard, could be a death penalty case. But those are the types of cases that the death penalty is limited to.

Do you think that's the -- those are appropriate types of cases?

A. Uh-huh.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. If it were up to you, would you might expand that to brutal crimes, such as, well, the Timothy Richardson case or something like that?
  - A. It would depend on the case, of course.
  - Q. The premeditation and that sort of thing?
  - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. But you agree that those crimes should be considered for the death penalty?
- A. Um, well, see, I have a difficult time here. Because if that's the law of the land, then I think we should abide by it and that should override my personal opinion.
- Q. But your personal belief is what, that you might expand it some?
  - A. I might expand it some, yes.
  - Q. Okay. That's fine. A lot of people feel that

way, too. But the crimes I talked about, you think are appropriate, just depending on the facts of each case?

- A. Say that again, please?
- Q. The murder during a robbery, that sort of thing, you feel could be appropriate, just depending on the facts of the case?
  - A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Okay. The way the law is set up, the trial is divided into two portions. We have the guilt/innocence stage where we have to prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty of the offense. If we do that, we then move to the punishment phase where you can hear additional evidence. The additional evidence could be the person's background, that sort of thing. It could be good things; it could be bad things. Then you get these Special Issues to answer in the punishment phase.
  - A. Okay.
- Q. We'll go over these in a little more detail in a minute.
- A. So the person's background would not be brought up during the --
  - Q. Guilt/innocence stage.
  - A. It would not?
- Q. No. Usually all we can talk about is the crime itself. Now, there are certain situations where maybe

the background would come up, but most cases, it doesn't.

Then in the punishment phase, you kind of get a view of their whole life, good things, bad things. And at that point in time you get these Special Issues.

The first issue basically asks is the defendant going to be a continuing danger to society? The second issue asks if the defendant actually caused the death or if they did not cause the death, did he intend for that to happen or anticipate that a life would be taken? And then the last question is a mitigation question which you kind of look at all the factors, all the evidence, and see if there's any mitigating circumstances in which you think a life sentence should be imposed, rather than a death sentence.

But if those questions -- and we will go in a little more detail in a minute. But if they are answered yes, yes, and no, the Judge would then sentence the defendant to death. He doesn't have any choice. He sentences the defendant by how the jury answers those questions. If they are answered any other way, he would sentence the defendant to life.

So if you found someone guilty of capital murder, the only two possible alternatives are going to be a life sentence or a death sentence and that all is determined by how you answer these questions. The Judge has no choice.

He's going to do -- he's going to sentence the defendant by how the questions are answered. Is that clear?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Are you aware of the method of execution in Texas?
  - A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. By lethal injection?
- A. Lethal injection, yes.
- Q. The procedures are the same in each case. If the defendant is found guilty and the questions are answered yes, yes, and no, the Judge sentences that person to death. He is placed on death row where he would wait for a number of years. I can't tell you how long. At some point in time the Judge would then issue a date of execution.

On that date or a date prior to that, actually, he would be moved to downtown Huntsville where the executions take place. The reporters often have detailed stories about executions. You may have read some of them. The execution is by lethal injection.

On the date of the execution, the execution would take place at 6:00 p.m. He would be given an opportunity to meet with his family, with friends, loved ones, with a minister, an opportunity for a last meal. But at 6:00 p.m. he would be taken to the execution chamber, put on a gurney, and strapped down by leather straps. They show

that photograph of the gurney all the time on the news.

There would be witnesses brought in for the defendant, also for the victim's family, if they desire to view the execution. He would be given a moment of about two minutes to give a last statement. At that point in time the warden then signals the executioner who would inject lethal substances which would cause his heart to stop, his lungs to collapse, and, basically, for him to fall into a sleep. It doesn't take long, but those are the procedures in each case.

And I don't mean to be morbid to go over that, but it's one thing when we talk about the death penalty in a philosophical sense or you saw that horrible case on the news or that sort of thing and it's another one when you come down here and realize I might be on a jury, making these decisions.

And we want to put all our cards out on the table. That's our goal in this case. As prosecutors, we feel we have the type of evidence to prove to a jury the defendant is guilty under the law and that these questions should be answered in such a way that result in his execution. The defense will take the opposite view, obviously. And that's why we bring a jury down here.

Now, you have told us philosophically that you believe in the death penalty as a law, the law of

the land --

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. Uh-huh.
- Q. -- for certain cases, depending on the facts.

  What I want to know is do you feel -- and you can only
  answer this because you know yourself a lot better than we
  will ever know you, that you are the type of person who
  could listen to this evidence and if the State does prove
  these issues to you, you could answer in such a way that the
  defendant would be executed some day?
- A. Okay. Will you repeat that just one more time?
- Q. Do you feel that you are the type of person that if we do prove these allegations to you, that you could take -- actually take pen in hand and answer the questions in a way, knowing that when you did so, that some day down the line that the defendant would actually be executed?
- A. Um, I have struggled with this since answering that questionnaire because I have always thought of it objectively and not on a personal basis. And, um, I'm just putting my cards on the table. I'm a little bit hesitant about the whole thing, because it is a personal thing that I will have to bear for the rest of my life. So --
  - Q. So you have some hesitation there?
  - A. Uh-huh.
  - Q. That's fine. That's why we ask the question

that way, because it's one thing to write about it or to talk about it --

- A. Right.
- Q. -- and it's a completely other thing when you realize that you have to participate in this decision.
  - A. Exactly.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

Q. We have some people that come and talk to us and say, you know what? I believe in the death penalty. I believe in it in almost every case. And put me on the jury, you know, I want to do it. They never make it on the jury. But we have some people that tell us that.

We have other people that will tell us, quite honestly, I have religious objections to it. I've always been opposed to it. And to be perfectly honest, I don't care how much evidence you give me, I'm not going to answer them that way and I'm not going to be responsible. I've got to live with myself.

We have other people that tell us, I agree with the law and I think certain people should be executed. I would vote for it every time, if it were coming up on a bill to pass or an amendment or something like that. But if you got me down here and I have to make that decision, I'm too uncomfortable and I could not make that decision because you have to live with yourself. And that's fine if they feel that way. We have people that agree about

the law, but can't actually participate. You might be fine in a burglary trial or regular murder case or DWI trial or civil case, but have hesitation where you are unable to do that.

And if you feel that way, that's fine, too. An example I give to take it out of this context is, I'm glad when I see a new skyscraper going up or building because I know that shows progress being made and shows a strong economy in Dallas, but I've always been terrified of heights. And I see these guys walking around on high beams, and I know I could never do that. I'm glad someone can, but I can't do it and I wouldn't do it.

But some jurors feel the same way about the death penalty. I believe in it as a law, but I can't make that particular decision. Because the bottom line is that's something that you would have to live with. After you made that decision, you may have to second guess yourself. You may read about the actual execution of the person, the relatives being sad, him claiming his innocence, or whatever. And some people can't do it.

And if you feel that way, that's fine, too. But we just need to know that, because, like I said, there's no right or wrong answers. As you thought about it and we've talked about it, you filled out the questionnaire, you thought about it more, now that you are actually here

today and you can see a living, breathing human being at that end of the table, one which we feel will lie dead on a gurney in Huntsville, Texas, because of the evidence, is this something that you personally don't think that you can do? You would be fine in another case, but you could not participate in this type of case because of your hesitations?

- A. (Long pause) Um, you know, I think I could do it, but it might be -- it might be difficult.
  - Q. Okay.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. You know, I know that's kind of an evasive answer, but --
  - Q. Well, you know --
- A. It's just one of those things. I guess I'm a very compassionate person and I love people. So -- but at the same time, you know, I feel like we should pay, you know, that punishment is what we need.
  - O. I understand that.
  - A. So --
- Q. From my point of view is this, once we put you on the jury, that's it. You are on. And that's why I need you to be as honest as you can right now, because you may be in a situation where eleven jurors go, look, they proved the case. We've got to answer these questions. And you are going, hey, I'm not comfortable with doing this.

And that's why, you know, as I said, there's nothing wrong with saying, hey, I couldn't do it, you know. But I don't want you to put yourself in a situation where you can't really do something and we go, fine, you said you could and let's get on the jury and that sort of thing.

But I'm never going to be able to know. You are the one that's going to be able to know that and you have never been in this situation.

- A. Right. I've never been in this situation.
- Q. And it's tough.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. And one of my little theories that I live by in my life is, if it's questionable, don't do it.
- Q. That's a pretty good philosophy. And does it feel questionable to you?
  - A. Uh-huh, yes.
- Q. Let me go with you on one further avenue and ask you about the law on this, because some people have greater hesitation on this area of the law.
  - A. Okay.
- Q. When we think of capital murder, we think of a guy who goes in and actually pulls the trigger. Okay? I go into a 7-Eleven, I pull a gun out, and I rob them and then I shoot the clerk. That's obviously a capital murder case and one in which we could seek the death penalty.

The law says, though, that more than one person can, obviously, commit certain crimes. Sometimes they commit them in a group. Sometimes there's only one person that actually commits the murder, but several people help carry out the crime.

A. Uh-huh.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Q. We can prosecute everyone involved in the case, if they are fully participating in the crime, for that crime and the same with capital murder. Let me give you an example.

Say me and Mr. Wirskye decide we want to rob a bank. We go in. I have a gun. Mr. Wirskye just starts loading up. He's got the bag. And I pull the gun out, cover everyone, and he loads the money up.

- A. Uh-huh.
- Q. But for whatever reason, I start shooting people. Maybe I kill one of the tellers. We leave the bank. We are caught later. I'm, obviously, guilty of capital murder. If I'm prosecuted, I could get the death penalty. Under the law Mr. Wirskye could also be prosecuted for capital murder. Not only could he be found guilty of capital murder because he participated in that event, but he could get the death penalty, even though he's not the triggerman.

And some people -- and that's the law.

But some people draw a line there, morally, for themselves. They say for the triggerman, I'm for that type of death penalty case. When you talk about a situation where an accomplice is involved that didn't pull the trigger, no, I'm not. We call that the law of parties. I would just draw a line there. Life sentence, 99 years, 70 years, whatever, yes. But I could never give someone a death penalty that's just an accomplice or a party to an offense.

A. Uh-huh.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Some people feel that way. Other people tell us, no, I could. How do you feel about that, that particular law? Is that something that you would draw a line on, if we were prosecuting a person who was not actually the killer, the triggerman, but just an accomplice or a party to the offense?
- A. I would have to have more information. But I probably would draw the line.
- Q. Okay. Is that -- and that's because they didn't actually commit the actual killing?
  - A. Uh-huh.
  - Q. A lot of people feel that way, too.
- A. But, see, on the other hand, he shouldn't have been with you.
  - Q. Right. Right.
  - A. So -- you know, that's -- I would have to hear

more or know more.

- Q. We can't go into the facts, obviously. All I can talk about is the law of parties itself. You could probably have some really brutal, where the accomplices are involved and some not. But some people would philosophically would draw a line there and say, look, I'm not going to execute people that aren't the triggerman. I'm going to reserve the death penalty for the killer.
- A. Okay. I'm thinking about it further. I would probably draw the line.
- Q. I mean, obviously, you could severely punish them with a life sentence or something.
  - A. Right.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. But if you would -- if it were up to you, reserve the death penalty for just the triggerman himself?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And as I said before, there aren't any right or wrong answers. We want to throw that out there because, again, putting all our cards on the table, we're prosecuting Mr. Murphy under the law of parties and we want to know from the get-go whether people can agree with that law or not. If you can't, that's fine. We have no argument with that.
- A. So are you asking me whether I agree with the law?
  - Q. Yes.

- A. I would -- if that's the law, then I would agree with it.
- Q. That's where we get a little sticky with jurors because we want to ask you beforehand, telling you what the law is, how you feel. Because some jurors say, if that's the law, then I agree with it.
  - A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. But then they have personal reservations that you reserve and say, look, that could be the law, but when I'm in the jury box, are you going to do what the law says or are you going to have these reservations? And there's nothing wrong with disagreeing with part of the law.
  - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. Everybody disagrees with some part of it. But when we have to make our decisions, we have to know if you are on board with that or is that something really we're fighting too much of an uphill battle. Put me on a different type of case.

What you have told me when we first began talking about this is if it came down to it, I guess, you would draw the line and reserve the death penalty for the triggerman, the person that actually caused the death?

- A. Well, okay. We were talking the law versus personal feeling.
  - Q. Right.

- A. And so -- you are asking me when it came down to it, what would I do?
- Q. I'm asking you -- well, let me ask you this way.' If we prosecuted a case to you under the law of parties, that is, the defendant didn't actually murder the person. It was an accomplice.
  - A. Right.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Do you personally feel that that's a death penalty case, that you could give someone the death penalty or is that a case where you would say, no, if it's a nontriggerman, I'm not for the death penalty. I would reserve that for the other person?
- A. Okay. Okay. I understand what you are saying. That would be questionable for me.
  - Q. You have some problems with that, too?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Well, I hate to keep beating around the bush or asking the same questions, but it's the only opportunity that I get to. And the Judge has to be sure on these things. But you, after thinking about it, I take it, have some reservations about personally participating in this type of trial?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. You agree with the law --
  - A. Yes.

- Q. -- feel it's appropriate, but just making this personal decision is something that you don't feel you would be comfortable doing?
  - A. Correct.

- Q. Okay. Fair enough. That's fine. We just want your honest opinions. And the reservations that you have about making a life and death decision, I take it that's not something that's going to go away anytime soon?
  - A. I don't think so.
- Q. Okay. Just from your demeanor I think I can tell that, but I want to make sure it's for the record. And are you telling us that this just isn't the type of case, a death penalty case, where you would make the life and death decision that you would be comfortable in making and don't -- I hate to put it this way, but maybe not objectively be able to look at the evidence because you are going to have these reservations, reservations about making a life or death decision?
- A. Well, see, that's where the other part of me comes into play. And I think if it's clear-cut, then I think that -- it's just a lot of uncertainty, I guess, within my being. But I feel strongly -- although I feel objectively strongly about the death penalty, can I issue that myself?
  - Q. Right.

1	A. Can I live with that?
2	Q. That's what you are struggling with?
3	A. That's what I'm struggling with.
4	Q. And that struggle continues today?
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. When you see this man that's alive here in the
7	courtroom and realize what our goal is?
8	A. (Prospective juror nods head.)
9	Q. As best you know yourself, then, do you think
10	this is the kind of case that you can participate in or just
11	not your cup of tea?
12	A. Um, well, I certainly feel like if I'm called,
13	God has called me to serve and then I would do that.
14	Q. Okay.
15	MR. SHOOK: Can I have just a moment,
16	Judge?
17	THE COURT: You may.
18	MR. SHOOK: May we approach the bench?
19	(Bench conference)
20	MS. BUSBEE: May it please the Court?
21	THE COURT: Ms. Busbee.
22	<u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u>
23	BY MS. BUSBEE:
24	Q. Ms. Lawson, I know this is torturous, but
25	here's the question in my mind. And let me take you to this

part. We're talking about people who are parties and to a hypothetical capital murder, not one that, you know, not talking about any specific facts. After a person has found someone guilty of capital murder as a party, they are eligible for the death penalty, certainly, that's correct.

But the juror has to go into an almost entirely different trial. It's a different trial. The second part has to do with these three issues. And these three issues as they are printed on that board, discuss what would be necessary for a jury to assess a death penalty to a party.

So, I mean, the first one makes sense. Is this person going to continue to be a threat? It's the second one that is unique to where someone is a party to an offense. That one says whether he actually caused the death or not, he either intended to kill the deceased or intended to kill someone or anticipated that a human life would be taken.

Before a juror would find that question yes, they would have to be satisfied. And I loved what you said, when it's questionable, don't do it. It's just a simple way of saying beyond a reasonable doubt. In fact, it's a better way to say it.

So I ask you this question. Under the circumstances where you have -- you are sitting on a

hypothetical capital murder jury and you have found that person guilty as a party, would you be comfortable following the law and if it was proved to you beyond a reasonable doubt, Special Issue No. 2 and Special Issue No. 1, could you answer yes to those questions?

- A. If I were called and on the jury?
- Q. Yes, ma'am.
- A. Yes.
- Q. So you see -- and, actually, you are the favorite kind of juror that we have because you are telling us the absolute truth. You are telling us how you feel, but that you would follow the law?
  - A. Right.
  - Q. Okay. I appreciate it.

### DIRECT EXAMINATION CONTINUED

### BY MR. SHOOK:

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. So the hesitation you had, you are telling us now --
  - A. No.
- Q. I can do it, it won't be a problem, if you prove the case to me?
- A. Okay. Um, I can do it. I can do anything.

  So if I were called, I could do that. But I'm telling you that still my personal feelings are still there.
  - Q. The hesitation?

- A. Uh-huh.
- Q. Let's talk, then, about some of these Special Issues.
  - A. Okay.
- Q. Special Issue No. 1 asks whether there is a probability that the defendant would commit criminal acts of violence that would constitute a continuing threat to society. That question starts out with a no answer and we have to prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt it should be answered yes.
  - A. Uh-huh.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. We do that by giving you new evidence, if there is -- or, obviously, you looking at the guilt/innocence evidence you have already heard and decide that. You are making a prediction of how the defendant will behave in the future. Do you feel you can answer that type of question?
  - A. Yes, definitely.
- Q. What types of evidence -- what type of evidence do you think would be important to you in reaching that decision?
- A. Um, see, here's -- okay. So this is the second phase of the trial, right? So background would definitely be important.
  - Q. Right. Okay. What about the facts of the

## case itself? Α. Yes. Q... Okay. What would be important about the background? Α. Well, whether this person is a habitual criminal. Q. Okay. If they have committed crimes like this before? Uh-huh or similar. Α. And you feel that if we have proven that type 10 of evidence to you, then you could answer that question yes? 11 A. Right. 12 What does the word "probability" mean to you 13 Q. in the context of that question? 14 Α. Um, chance. 15 Q. Okay. Just any chance at all that he would be 16 17 a continuing danger? 18 Α. Well, it's more of a positive to me. Q. Okay. Anyway you could put a percentage on 19 20 it? Α. On the word "probability"? 21 Q. Uh-huh. 22 Um, I don't know. Are you saying a percentage 23 Α. just on the word or on the whole --24 Q. Just on the whole question? 25

- A. -- statement? So, for instance, what you are asking me is if I said that there's a 90-percent chance that the defendant would commit another crime. Is that how you
- Q. Well, I'm just kind of asking you how you feel about it, because it's kind of an openended question. I'm just trying to get a feel on how you view the question.
  - A. See, I feel like that's not openended.
  - Q. Okay.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. I feel like it's definite. I mean, I know you are trying to foresee the future, but I also feel like if you have seen patterns --
  - Q. A pattern in the past?
  - A. Past patterns.
- Q. That's going to make the question pretty easy for you?
  - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. The second question asks whether the defendant actually caused the death of the deceased or did not actually cause the death of the deceased, but intended to kill the deceased or another or anticipated that a human life would be taken. It gets kind of confusing. But that's what we're talking about where the law of parties comes in.
  - A. Uh-huh.
  - Q. It's an easy question if you believe from the

evidence that he actually caused the death. But the other part gets into if he's just a party or accomplice.

A. Right.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Did not actually cause the death, but intended to kill the deceased or another. Maybe he intended to.

Maybe someone else murdered the deceased before he had the chance or maybe that was his intentions or he just anticipated that a human life would be taken. Okay? He didn't pull the trigger, didn't cause the murder, but he anticipated based on the facts that a life would be taken.

Do you feel you can answer that question yes, depending on the facts of the case?

- A. Depending on the facts of the case, yes.
- Q. And if you believe that's true, that's what we're talking about, someone that's not a triggerman, they are a party to it, you would answer that yes?
- A. Yes. Because intended to kill to me means they thought about -- I don't know if I -- I guess I would equate it to premeditated, if you intend to kill somebody.
- Q. Intention can be formed in about a split second. When you are talking about premeditated, someone planned it out?
  - A. Well, nevertheless --
  - Q. Okay. You are comfortable with that?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. And then this last Special Issue, if you take a moment to read that to yourself.
  - A. [Prospective juror complies.] Okay.
- Q. That's the last question you get. It kind of -- no one has the burden of proof on it. It lets you look at everything in the person's background and the crime and decide if you think that a life sentence is appropriate, instead of a death sentence. Do you think that's a fair question to have?
- A. Um, well, I do think it's a fair question, but that's in the punishment phase, correct?
  - Q. Uh-huh.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. So I think it's a fair question.
- Q. You don't get to that question until you have already found the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt of capital murder, you have found he's a continuing danger to society, you found that he either caused the death or anticipated that a death would occur. That's all been proven to you beyond a reasonable doubt. Then you consider this question.
  - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. Do you think that you could answer that question in a way that you could answer it yes, knowing all that and already made those findings? In other words, would you be able to sentence someone to a life sentence, even

though you thought he was guilty of capital murder, a continuing danger to society, and anticipated or intended someone to die, even if he wasn't the actual triggerman?

- A. Okay. I'm a little confused. So I thought you had said earlier that if the first two issues are answered yes, then it's definitely a death penalty.
- Q. It is if the last answer is a no. Now, if you answer that one yes, if there's mitigating evidence, then even though you answered those things, he gets a life sentence.
  - A. Okay. Let me take a minute to reread it.
  - Q. Okay.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. Okay. Could you put that in layman's terms for me?
- Q. That's a tough question. Basically, what it says is you can consider all the evidence, the crime itself, what the person's role in it was, anything about their character and background, the previous bad acts, if they have seen a bad pattern, or it could be maybe they had --well, we ask that question. Mitigating evidence can be anything you want it to be. It could be a person's background, how they were raised.
  - A. So what does mitigating mean?
- Q. Something that lessens your moral culpability.

  But it's up to you and the other jurors. We can't even tell

you what it is. We just have to see if your mind's open to it. Some jurors have told us young age is mitigating.

Someone in their early 20's or 19 years old, that could be mitigating. Other jurors say if they know what they're doing, no, it's not mitigating.

Some jurors -- a big question comes up is how a person was raised, their background. Maybe they had a -- maybe they were beaten, maybe they were abused mentally or physically, maybe they grew up in a poor neighborhood, maybe they didn't have a parent or father in the home.

Other jurors tell us, I feel bad if they were abused as a child, but that's not an excuse once you grow up as an adult. A lot of people grow up in that situation and don't murder people.

How do you feel about that type of background evidence? Is that something that you view as mitigating or not?

- A. Well, if you grew up as an abused person and you're an adult now, I feel like that you have had your adult years to turn yourself around.
- Q. Okay. Is there anything as you sit here today that you might view as potentially mitigating evidence? Any other types of evidence? Anything come to mind?
  - A. Such as the background in their lives?
  - Q. Yes.

A. What would influence me?

- Q. Yeah. Does anything strike you as potentially mitigating? I know you haven't sat around and thought about these issues, at least I hope you haven't. But --
- A. Um, I guess not really. Because, you know, I just feel like that a person should get it by the time they are an adult.
- Q. Fair enough. Some people actually tell us this. Look, if we have gone this far, if he's in my mind guilty and a continuing danger and did anticipate someone would die, then I'm not open to that question, to be perfectly honest, and I'm not going to answer that in a way. I mean, the death penalty is pretty much decided. Other people tell us, I'll keep my mind open to it. I'll listen to it. And if I think something is mitigating sufficiently where a life sentence is more appropriate, I will answer it that way. Other people, quite frankly, are closed to it once they have already made these other decisions.

How do you feel about that? Is this something that you can keep your mind open to, once you reach this stage?

A. I think that I can keep my mind open to it. You know, it all deals with the person and what he's gone through. Um, if he's an adult and still a habitual criminal, then I feel like he's had the opportunity to

straighten himself out in prison through the corrections system.

- Q. Let me go into one other area now. One, we can't get into the facts, but, obviously, we ask about this case because it had a lot of news coverage.
  - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. What do you remember? It's been a while, but what do you remember about the news coverage that you personally watched or read?
- A. I remember the story about the police officer being slain and I believe it was Oshman's?
  - Q. Right.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. I remember hearing interviews with the officer's -- either his wife or his mother, I can't remember which one, on the radio. I remember being on the lookout of the Texas Seven and talking about it maybe socially. Um, I remember when -- I think I remember when they got caught. It was in -- was it in Colorado? Or I'm not sure. North, instead of south. And I also remember that one of them committed suicide.
- Q. Did you follow any of the other trials on the news?
- A. I did not follow all of them. Although shortly after the May jury duty, I recall hearing that the previous five had all been sentenced to the death penalty.

Q. Obviously, in high publicity cases almost all the jurors have heard something about the case. The law is this, whatever you have heard you can't take that and let that affect your decision. Some jurors can do that and other jurors have read so much where it would affect their decision. They couldn't put it out of their mind. We just ask every juror individually how they feel about that.

Is what you have read or heard something that would affect your decision already or is it something that you can decide this case based on the facts and what you hear in the courtroom?

- A. I think definitely decide it on the facts. In fact, I did not, intentionally did not go home and look on the Internet for more facts or more information.
- Q. Okay. The fact -- when we talk about this mitigating question, the fact that we would be prosecuting the defendant under the theory of parties, that he's a nontriggerman --
  - A. Uh-huh.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. -- do you think that might potentially be a mitigating circumstance to you?
- A. Um, that -- okay. Say that again, because we would have already decided in 2.
- Q. You decided that he anticipated, you know, under the law of parties.

- A. Right.
- Q. But then other jurors have told us, I can answer question No. 2 yes, yeah, he anticipated, but when I look at this last question about what mitigation is, that's going to come into play if I don't think that he's the actual killer or he's not. He just anticipated. That might be a mitigating fact. Other people tell us that's not really the type of information I'm looking at.
- A. Okay. I'm a little confused, because I feel like the -- I mean, to say it simplistically, that the nontrigger issue is addressed in No. 2 and not in No. 3.
- Q. Okay. So -- and it's up to you because mitigation can be actually anything you want it to be as a juror.
  - A. Oh, okay.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. We can't tell you what it is. It's anything that you want it to be. And one juror might believe, actually, yeah, if he's just a party, an accomplice, a nontriggerman, that's going to be a mitigating issue to me. Other jurors might tell us, no, that's for the other questions. I'm not really interested in that, once I've reached that.
  - A. I'm not interested in that at that point.
  - Q. You feel that's satisfied?
  - A. Uh-huh,

The bottom line, then, is you believe in the Q. death penalty as a law? Α. Correct. 0. You feel it should be prosecuted? Α. Yes. ο. You feel that it should be prosecuted or be a law under the law of parties where they are the nontriggerman as a death penalty case? Say that again, the last part of that. Α. Q. You agree the law says that a nontriggerman 10 Yes. Α. 11 -- can be prosecuted under the law of parties 0. 12 and you agree with that law? 13 14 Α. Yes. 15 0. As best you know yourself, because you kind of have given me some different answers --16 Α. Right. 17 18 Q. -- as best you know yourself, if we prosecute and are prosecuting the defendant in this case under the law 19 of parties, that if we prove to you beyond a reasonable 20 21 doubt, you could find the defendant guilty, you could answer these questions in a way, yes, yes, and no, if the facts 22 prove it to you, knowing that the defendant here, Mr. 23 Murphy, will be executed some day, could you do that? 24 Α. (Long pause) I hate to be so wishy-washy. 25

know I could do it. But I would still have some innate hesitation.

- Q. Do you think that hesitation would prevent you from answering those questions, then?
- A. From answering those questions? Wouldn't prevent me from answering those questions, but it's the end result of the questions.
  - Q. Right. That's the sticky part.
  - A. I know that's difficult.
  - Q. Because we have to make a decision --
  - A. I know you do.

10

11

12

1,3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

- Q. -- based on your answers.
- A. I know you do. I know you do. So that's me. That's what you get.
- Q. When it comes down to the bottom line, as best you know yourself, then, is this a case that you can participate in or is that hesitation going to be something that's not going to leave you?
- A. Well, you know, I vacillate mentally. If it's beyond a reasonable doubt, you know, I believe that I could do it. If it's not, I might be one of those that can't do it.
- Q. Well, yeah. And I see you do vacillate. You are still struggling with it --
  - A. Uh-huh.

- Q. -- and that's my concern.
- A. Yes.
- Q. Because from my position, obviously, I don't want someone over there that is like maybe in the middle of it go, look, this is not something that I can do, participate in it and take someone's life. And then at that point, obviously, there's not a thing we can do about it. You are just going to have to do it.

But that's why I keep asking you the bottom line. Because I see you struggling and the hesitation is still there.

A. Uh-huh.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. And that's what, quite frankly, worries me.
- A. Uh-huh.
- Q. But I just -- I just kind of want to, you know, it seems to me like that hesitation is probably not going to leave you, even though intellectually you might say certain things may be true and you sit there and look at someone that's been there for two weeks, seeing him sit there every day, it's something that is going to tug at you?
- A. It would definitely tug at me. However, I wouldn't be human, if it didn't.
- Q. Do you think that you could overcome that, then, or is it just a situation where, I don't know?
  - A. I don't know. It is I don't know. You know,

I feel like that it's hard to make a prediction on the way

I'm going to feel without hearing all the evidence.

Q. Uh-huh. And unfortunately I can't preview all the evidence for you.

MR. SHOOK: Judge, I believe that's all the questions I have. Thank you.

THE COURT: You're only halfway through with this. Ms. Busbee has a few questions for you as well.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

#### BY MS. BUSBEE:

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. And relax. You are not going -- Mr. Shook has covered the law so well that I just want to talk to you for a little bit.
  - A. Okay.
- Q. Because we know your background and we know that despite the fact that you don't have a job in an office, it looks like you do a lot of different things.
  - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. Could you tell me -- you were talking about volunteering at your school and I take it that's your kids' school and some of the things you are involved in?
- A. Um, okay. Well, I'm very involved in their school. I have cafeteria duty once a week. My two older children are in college, so I don't do volunteer work associated them anymore. It's more with the littler one.

She's involved in theater. I do a lot of that and choir, a lot of parental help with that. She's busy with dancing and singing and volleyball. And I'm probably what you would call a soccer mom, even though soccer is not in our realm.

- Q. You are as busy as?
- A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Q. I just wanted to get you away a little bit from asking you these same questions in different ways, because you sit through one of these and you realize why people hate lawyers, because we're trying to make you split hairs that we just introduced you to.

I mean, to me I think that this is -that you have answered this question, but I want to get away
from asking it over and over so we could kind of have a
fresh start.

I hear you say that this would be a very serious duty to you?

- A. Yes.
- Q. And that shouldn't bother any of us, because, obviously, it's a very serious proceeding since we're doing it in this manner with all these jurors and the law is as complex as any criminal law that I'm aware of. The courts say that these laws must be very, very specific. And in order to give a death penalty, it's a very limited individual that deserves the death penalty and they limited

it so that they can be comfortable with the jurors' decision to give or to assess a death penalty.

And so, essentially, I've heard this described as hurdles to jump over. Assuming that the person has been found guilty of capital murder as a party, I don't think we have any problem with Special Issue No. 1.

- A. Right.
- Q. Even anticipating that an answer of yes to that may result in the death penalty, you wouldn't have any trouble answering that question?
  - A. No.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Now, on Special Issue No. 2, I hear you saying, all of this is hard, but if it's proved to me beyond a reasonable doubt, I can answer yes.
  - A. Right.
- Q. So they have to prove it to you beyond a reasonable doubt, so I'm hearing you saying you can follow the law?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Here's -- Special Issue No. 3 is described by some of us as -- mitigating, I don't know what that is. And sometimes we go into children and that sort of thing and you have the same attitude that I have and most people have.

  Come on, you now, you're an adult. Get counseling and get over it. Don't inflict it on the rest of us.

A. Uh-huh.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. But I like to call it a safety valve. And it's just like Mr. Shook described to you, you don't have to be able to say, there's just this one thing that makes me say that even though I have answered 1 and 2 yes, I don't -- I'm going to answer this yes as well. But even though 1 and 2 have been proven to me beyond a reasonable doubt, I still think that this individual should not receive the ultimate penalty of death.

And you don't have to -- you know, nobody is trying to commit you to that because it may be something that you, yourself, can't express, a feeling that you have. Usually there's a reason for it. I assume that since you will be careful on Special Issues No. 1 and 2 that you are going to have a reasoned reason, if that makes any sense, for Special Issue No. 3. I feel that even though I have found 1 and 2 to be true beyond a reasonable doubt, I don't believe a death penalty should be imposed in this case. It's just a safety valve. Do you understand?

- A. I understand what you are saying. But I thought if 1 and 2 -- okay, so if 3 is answered --
  - Q. It sort of says, but anyway --
  - A. Anyway life instead of death.
  - Q. Right.
  - A. Okay. So --

- Q. It's awkward.
- A. So tell me your question.
- Q. Well, can you do that?
- A. Can I do No. 3?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Yes, ma'am. Either way. I mean, having found Special Issue 1 and 2 true, you then get to the third issue which is even though I do believe the other two things beyond a reasonable doubt, I still feel -- and this is -- of course, I can't give examples. But I still believe that there should be a life sentence instead of death.
- A. Well, I feel like if the defendant intended to kill the deceased, that that would warrant the death sentence.
- Q. Okay. So I think what you are telling me is, if you answered yes to Special Issue No. 1 and Special Issue No. 2, there would be nothing that would make you opt to answer yes to question 3, yes being the answer that would cause it to be a life sentence?
- A. Right. Well, I tell you what, if this person were just an outstanding citizen --
- Q. And you don't even have to articulate what your reasons might be, just that you would seriously consider Special Issue No. 3 and if you felt that that person should not get death, you would vote that way?
  - A. Okay. Um, let me focus more on this, again,

for a minute.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Sure.
- A. Previously, I was concentrating just on those two, the first two issues, and probably not giving enough emphasis to No. 3 and that's really important. Um, but I still feel strongly. I have to say I feel strongly -- I think that I would, if the first two were proved without, you know, beyond a reasonable doubt, that No. 3 would impose the death sentence.
- Q. So you couldn't answer yes to No. 3 if you had found 1 and 2 beyond a reasonable doubt? It's not a character flaw on your part. It's just how you --
  - A. Right.
  - Q. -- are personally.
- A. Right. Well, I'm trying to figure that out right now.
- Q. It's hard to explain for me and it's even harder for someone who has never seen it before, so I understand.
- A. Um, and it's just so difficult, since I've never been on a jury before, to --

MR. SHOOK: Judge, we have an agreement.

MS. BUSBEE: We've decided not to torture

her anymore.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Lawson, I bet

when you came down here this morning you had no idea how complicated the law really is.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I had no idea.

THE COURT: You have learned more today than you probably have ever watching TV, read about in school, or whatever. We appreciate your honesty. Trust me, the lawyers would rather have your honesty and talk to you for an hour and a half and say we're going to let you go, than you hide the ball and not be honest.

We appreciate it. You are excused from your jury service. And you can tell your children what you learned today. Please give the guide back to the Sheriff.

And we'll take a short break.

(Recess)

[Prospective juror out]

THE COURT: Mr. Shannon, please.

[Prospective juror in]

THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Shannon,

how are you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Pretty good.

Yourself?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Doing pretty good, trying to get the courtroom cooled off a little bit, but that's about normal for the county. You have had enough time this morning to read the orientation guide?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I have.

THE COURT: View the witness list?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Right.

may be called? Do you have any problem serving this Court with the scheduled November 10th trial date?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah, I read that.

THE COURT: Would you have any problem

serving the Court?

10

. 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, no.

THE COURT: I know that we have given you a lot of law to think about in the handout. Do you have any questions of me about the law we'll be talking about here today before we begin?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: I'm quite sure the lawyers are going to spend a lot of time with you. You are still under oath to tell the truth. That's all we ask. Don't worry about what it is, just, you know, this is what I think. This is what I believe. The lawyers will appreciate that and we'll proceed forward from there. With that, I'll turn it over to Mr. Wirskye.

MR. WIRSKYE: May it please the Court.

#### DAVID SHANNON,

having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as

follows:

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

#### **DIRECT EXAMINATION**

# BY MR. WIRSKYE:

- Q. Mr. Shannon, how are you?
- A. Very good.
- Q. Again, my name is Bill Wirskye and I'll be the prosecutor that's going to be visiting with you for the next few minutes. It looks like on your questionnaire you may have gone through this once before; is that right?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. Well, I don't know how much you remember. Was it '94, '95?
  - A. I don't remember. It's been a while ago.
- Q. Ultimately, you didn't end up making the jury; is that right?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. But you did come down and talk to both lawyers?
  - A. Right.
- Q. Again, we apologize. It makes a lot of people feel they are on trial because they are sitting up there on the witness stand, but it's kind of the best system that we have.
- I'll talk to you a little bit briefly about some of the answers in your questionnaire, get some of

your thoughts on the death penalty, and then we'll talk more specifically about some of the legal aspects that may apply and hopefully your previous experience will help you through this and make it a little bit shorter for you.

A. Okay.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. You told us that you do believe in the death penalty; is that right?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. Is that something that you have believed in all your life?
  - A. Pretty much, yeah.
- Q. What value do you see to, I guess, our society, having a death penalty?
- A. Get rid of criminals, people that break the law.
- Q. When you think about an appropriate-type case for the death penalty, is there a particular type case that comes to mind?
  - A. Murder.
- Q. Okay. Any particular case you may have heard or read about or high profile case that when you think about it, you think to yourself, gee, that's a good candidate or a good case for the death penalty?
  - A. The one that I was called on previously.
  - Q. Okay. And looks like you ended up following

that?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- A. Right.
- Q. At least through the paper?
- A. Yes, sir, sure did.
- Q. And saw the end result?
- A. I saw that it was pretty colorful.
- Q. And you saw how -- I guess the defendant in that case acted up a little bit?
  - A. Yes, he did.
- Q. Do you hold that belief so strongly that, you know, that you would say there's never a murder case where maybe a life sentence would be more appropriate other than the death penalty?
  - A. Pretty much.
- Q. Okay. When you say pretty much, I guess is there certain cases out there -- again, this is your personal feelings. We're not talking about the law. Some cases out there where you may think, you know, death is a little extreme for that particular person or for that particular crime? Sounds like you are at least open to the possibility?
  - A. Okay. I'm not going to say no to that.
- Q. Okay. As you may remember from last time, if you do make the jury in a capital case, we don't ask the jury just to answer the question, you know, should the

defendant get a life sentence or should the death penalty be imposed?

What we do is, we ask the jurors -- if they convict someone of capital murder, we ask the jurors to answer these three questions. They are called Special Issues, but they are basically questions. And depending on the answers to those questions, that determines whether the defendant is actually sentenced to death. I don't know if you recall that --

A. I don't.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. --- almost ten years ago?
- A. Right.
- Q. But it's not a situation that we ask you as a juror to kind of give a thumbs up or thumbs down on the death penalty. We just give you these questions. Depending on the answers to those questions, that determines the appropriate sentence in a case. Does that sound fair to you?
  - A. Right.
- Q. Okay. We talked to you just a little bit about this. You know, oftentimes crimes aren't committed by just one person. You know, we think about a murder case, we think about one guy maybe going into a 7-Eleven, robbing the clerk, pulling the trigger, killing him during a robbery. But oftentimes crimes are committed by groups or gangs of

people, that type of thing.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The law allows us in those cases to actually prosecute for the death penalty, depending on the fact's and circumstances, people that didn't actually pull the trigger, nontriggermen. That's that the law in Texas allows us to do.

How do you feel about that, just off the top of your head?

- A. I don't have a problem with that.
- Q. Very frankly, we talk to some people that come down here and they say, you know, I believe in the death penalty for the person that pulled the trigger. But when you start talking about people who are accomplices or who are helping out in the offense who didn't pull the trigger, for those people I take the death penalty completely off the table.

But you sound like you would be able to follow the law and at least be able to consider the death sentence as an appropriate punishment for a person that didn't actually pull the trigger; is that right?

- A. That's correct.
- Q. And I'll be honest with you and lay all the cards right out on the table. In this case we don't anticipate the evidence will show that he pulled the trigger. We're prosecuting him as an accomplice or a party

to the offense, is what we call it in Texas. But sounds like you have no hesitations going into a trial of that nature, being able to answer these questions and follow the law; is that right? That's correct. Α. Let me talk to you a little bit about the 0. publicity in this case. Just based on what you heard back in May when you came down, thinking about the case, showing up today, do you think that you may have heard anything about this case? 10 11 Α. No. Okay. You have no idea why we're down here or 0. 12 any particular facts, haven't heard anything in the media or 13 anything like that? 14 Since it happened or since I came down? Α. 15 Q. Uh-huh. 16 No. 17 Α. Okay. But did you hear anything back when the Q. 18 crime is alleged to have occurred? 19 Α. Yes. 20 Back in December, 2000? 0. 21 Α. Right. 22 About the murder of a police officer over by Q. 23 Oshman's? 24 Α. Right. 25

Q. Okay. Obviously, in cases like this that are high profile cases, almost everyone we talk to has heard something about the case. And that does not necessarily mean you are disqualified or can't be a fair and qualified juror. What the law says is, you know, despite what you may have heard or read or seen on TV, that type thing, as long as you can kind of base your decision in the case just on the evidence and facts that you hear in the courtroom, you would still be a qualified juror and be able to sit.

And, you know, we talk to a lot of people and, very frankly, some of them tell us they can't do that. They say, you know, I may have heard so much about this case, you know, I've already formed an opinion and I can't base my verdict just on what I hear in the courtroom.

Kind of where do you fall in that? Do you think that you would be able to base your verdict on just what you hear in the courtroom?

A. Yes.

- Q. Okay. No problem just listening to the facts and the evidence and deciding whether the person is guilty and then answering those three questions or anything like that?
  - A. No problem.
- Q. Okay. Do you have your juror guide up there in front of you? Did you bring it in?

- A. Juror guide? No, I did not.
- Q. Okay. Fair enough. Just to kind of give you a brief overview. What we do in these cases, is basically the trial is broken down into two parts. If you can flip to the very back of the last page on there, there should be a copy of something called the indictment. If you can just look at that real briefly.
  - A. Okay. I'm looking at it.
- Q. That's basically what we've charged in this case. We have kind of charged that capital murder has been committed two different ways, one, that a police officer was killed during the course of his duties; the second way would be that an intentional killing happened during the course of a robbery. If we prove one or prove either or both to a jury beyond a reasonable doubt, which is our burden, then the law would require the jury to find the defendant guilty.

And that's basically the first part of the trial. You hear the facts and evidence, just basically about the case, what happened out there, and it's up to a jury to decide whether we have met our burden and proven beyond a reasonable doubt whether the person is guilty.

Does that make sense to you?

A. Yeah.

Q. Okay. If we do that, then we slip into the second phase of the trial. And during the second phase of

the trial the rules of evidence kind of broaden out a little bit. You get to hear more facts about the man, the person, you know, background, character, that type of thing. May have been a real bad guy. May have been a real good guy. But you get to hear that extra or additional evidence to help you answer these Special Issues. Does that make sense to you?

- A. Right.
- Q. Again, the fact that you may have found somebody guilty of capital murder does not necessarily in and of itself or automatically help jurors answer any of these three Special Issues. Does that make sense?
  - A. Yes.

Q. Okay. We ask jurors, even though you found the person guilty of capital murder, to step back and answer each of these issues independently. Don't do anything automatically. Go back and take a fresh look at all the evidence you have heard and decide what the answers to these questions should be.

And just briefly, if you look up there, question No. 1, whether the person is going to be a future danger to society, basically. And we'll talk more about that in a second. We have the burden of proving that to a jury beyond a reasonable doubt, just like we did guilt. And if we meet that burden and the answer to that question is

yes, you move on to Special Issue No. 2.

And this question kind of deals with what we've already talked about, you know, did the person actually pulled the trigger, was a nontriggerman. That's kind of what Special Issue No. 2 deals with. It's easy to answer that question if the person on trial actually pulled the trigger. If they didn't, like the case we're here on today, a nontriggerman, the jury would need to decide that the person intended that person to be killed or anticipated that a life would be taken.

Again, it's our burden to prove that to you beyond a reasonable doubt. If the answer is yes, then you move on to the Special Issue No. 3. It's kind of the safety net.

No. 3 is a little bit different than 1 and 2 in that there's no burden of proof. It's just up to the jurors. It's kind of the, like I said, the catch-all safety net. Step back, take a deep breath, see if there's anything mitigating, such that a person's life should be spared and they shouldn't face the death penalty. Does that scheme kind of make sense --

A. Yes.

Q. -- to you? And, again, you know, just because you found someone guilty of capital murder, you don't automatically or necessarily answer those questions any

particular way. We want jurors who can be fair and keep that open mind and really work through each of these questions, looking at the evidence.

Do you think that you are the type of person that could do that?

A. Yes.

- Issue No. 1. Again, this is the question that deals with whether a person would constitute a continuing threat to society. There's a couple of terms in that question that really aren't defined. Unlike a lot of things the lawyers do, we don't have specific definitions for those terms. I think it's because it's probably pretty much a common sense question when you look at it. But when you see that word "probability", just off the top of your head, what does that mean to you?
- A. Well, whether, I guess, he's going to commit a -- probably do it again, do something just as violent.
- Q. Uh-huh. I think, you know, when we look at probability, more likely than not, I think. You know, we don't have to prove to you that it's going to happen. You know, obviously we could never do that. That question kind of asks a juror, I guess, to make a prediction about future behavior or future events.

Is that something you feel comfortable

with, making that prediction, you know, having sat through the guilt part of the trial and having sat through the second part of the trial, the punishment phase, is that something that you think you can do?

- A. Yeah.
- Q. Then we have that phrase "commit criminal acts of violence." I'm just curious what that means to you, "criminal acts of violence"?
- A. I guess if he had the opportunity to do it, he would do it again.
- Q. Any particular crime that strikes you when we're talking about a criminal act of violence? I mean, obviously, another murder or rape or something like that?
  - A. Right.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. The law doesn't necessarily define it, again.

  It's just whatever a juror thinks would constitute a

  criminal act of violence. Could be an assault or threat,

  something like that. Does that make sense to you?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. I guess the bottom line is, you know, I don't want you to think that we have to prove there's a high probability that he would kill again or participate in another murder. Does that make sense to you?
  - A. Right.
  - Q. Then, finally, the last word in that question

talks about society. I'm just curious how you would define "society" or if you put any limits on it as between people out here in the free world or people locked up behind bars or how would you define that?

- A. It's, obviously, going to be a criminal society, incarceration.
- Q. Okay. So you would define it very broadly to include people like prison guards, ministers that work in prisons, that type thing?
- A. I don't guess that you can throw out the probability of escape again. So you would have to -- this is society out here and society in incarceration.
  - Q So you define it broadly to include everybody?
  - A. Right.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Okay. Does that question make sense to you?

Do you kind of see why the law asks jurors to look at it?

And I'll tell you why I ask that question. We have some people down here who come down and, you know, if they found somebody guilty of capital murder, by the time we get to that second phase of the trial, their mind is closed. It's kind of shut down. They are not really going to work through these questions.

And they tell us, you know, gee,
Mr. Wirskye, if I find somebody guilty of capital murder,
the triggerman or nontriggerman, by the time I get to

Special Issue No. 1, that's automatically answered for me.

If I find somebody guilty of that act, it's automatic. I'm
going to answer it yes every time.

What the law says is, again, you can't do it automatically. You have to take that fresh or that independent look at Special Issue No. 1. You know, you are certainly allowed to go back and look at the facts of the offense to help you make that decision. You just can't do it automatically. It has to be a separate, independent inquiry for each question. Does that make sense to you?

A. Yeah.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Do you think, even having found somebody guilty of capital murder, either as a triggerman or nontriggerman, by the time you got to Special Issue No. 1 you would still have an open mind? You would work through that question and you wouldn't just automatically answer it yes?
  - A. Yeah, I think I could.
- Q. Okay. You keep that open mind, take a fresh look. You wouldn't have any problem with that? It wouldn't be automatic?
  - A. No.
- Q. Again, we have the burden of proof to you on that question. We have got to prove it to you just like we did his guilt with evidence beyond a reasonable doubt. If

the answer to that question is yes, we move on to Special Issue No. 2.

Again, like I said, this is the question that deals with, you know, when people act in gangs or groups, who's the triggerman, who's not the triggerman?

Obviously, if you think that he actually pulled the trigger and killed the person, that's an easy answer. Okay? The answer would be yes.

But, again, I've told you what our cards are that we laid them outside on the table for you. We're prosecuting him as a nontriggerman or as an accomplice. So it would be up to you as a juror to decide whether we have proven to you beyond a reasonable doubt that he intended a human life to be taken or that he anticipated that a human life would be taken. Does that make sense to you?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Just to back up for just a second, when you find somebody guilty of capital murder as a nontriggerman, okay, you either have to decide that he helped out the person that pulled the trigger, knowing, you know, helped him commit the capital murder or you have to decide that he should have anticipated that a human life would be taken. Okay? That's the standard, should have anticipated in order to convict someone of capital murder.

By the time we get to punishment, the law

imposes a little bit higher burden on us and instead of should have anticipated, the question becomes, did they actually anticipate? You can kind of see the difference between those two?

A. Yeah.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Okay. Let's say Mr. Shook and I go in to do a bank robbery. He's carrying three fully loaded guns and I know him to be an angry and violent person. And we go in there and something goes wrong. He gets mad and he shoots and kills someone. He's the triggerman. He's committed capital murder.

anticipated that a human life could be taken, they would find me guilty as an accomplice or conspirator to capital murder. And if they found me guilty and we got to Special Issue No. 2, then the jury would have to decide not only should I have anticipated, but did I actually anticipate? See the difference?

- A Yes
- Q. Just a little higher burden before we impose the death penalty. I want to make sure that you see kind of the meaningful distinction between should have and actually did. Does that make sense to you?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. Okay. But if you look at something like that

and, again, it's up to us to prove it to you beyond a reasonable doubt and you answer that question yes, you move on to Special Issue No. 3.

Special Issue No. 3, again, is a little bit different. Neither side has the burden of proof. It's kind of the last stop in the process of a death penalty, because at this point you have found him guilty of capital murder, you said he's going to be a future danger, you said he either pulled the trigger or he anticipated or intended that somebody would be killed. And this is the last question. It kind of requires you to take a deep breath, take a step back, and look at everything you have heard, the facts of the offense, everything that you may have learned about him, and ask yourself, is there anything that is mitigating and if there is, is it sufficiently mitigating that his life ought to be spared? Does that make sense to you?

A. Yeah.

Q. And, again, we talk to some people who would tell us, very frankly, by the time I get to Special Issue No. 3, my mind is closed. They tell me, Mr. Wirskye, I found him guilty of capital murder, I said he's going to be a danger, I said he pulled the trigger, that he intended or anticipated, and by the time I get to Special Issue No. 3, that's really no value in that question for me. Okay? By the time we get that far in the process, it's over. I'm not

going to work through that question. I'm not going to make that independent inquiry. I'm just going to automatically answer it no, such that he would get a death penalty.

And we've talked to a lot of people like that. But I want to make sure before we go on that you are not one of those people, very frankly, that you do see some value and some meaning to Special Issue No. 3, and if you have got there, that you could go back and look at everything else and see if there was anything mitigating in the background or the crime to where his life ought to be spared. Does that make sense to you?

A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Do you think that you could do that?
- A. Yeah.
- Q. Okay. Your mind wouldn't be closed at that point? That question No. 3 would still have some value to you?
  - A. Right.
- Q. Okay. When you talk about mitigating evidence, the law doesn't really define what mitigating is. You know, a lot of people talk about reducing the moral blameworthiness, you know, what blame does a person bear? The law doesn't require that you consider any particular thing mitigating.

You know, we talk to some people who say,

well, if the person was young, he was 19 or 20, to me that's mitigating. Some people say, you know, by 19 or 20 you ought to know right from wrong. You ought to be held responsible for your actions. I don't consider that mitigating. And there can be a difference of opinion. Even the jurors don't have to agree on what may be mitigating. Does that make sense to you?

- A. Yeah.
- Q. Okay. Anything off the top of your head strike you as something that may be mitigating?
  - A. No.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Okay. And that's the answer we most commonly get. Hopefully, you know, people don't sit around thinking about what would be mitigating in a death penalty case. And the law doesn't require you to think of something right now. It just requires that you keep that open mind and, basically, it requires that when you get to that question, you say, I have an open mind. If I hear something that I think is mitigating, I'm going to think about it and I'm going to go back and look at this question and answer that question honestly and independently. Does that make sense?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. So your mind is not closed to mitigation?
  - A. No.

- Q. Okay. You recognize the possibility there could be something mitigating?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. It may be slim and it may be slight, but as long as you can keep that open mind, you would be a qualified juror. As long as you can follow the law, you would be a qualified juror. That's kind of what you are telling me you can do; is that right?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. Do you have any questions about any of these?
  - A. No.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Mr. Shannon, I know that I'm kind of running through it pretty quick, but I kind of feel like even though it was ten years ago, this is the second time that you have heard this. Again, all it boils down to is being able to keep that open mind, follow the law, you don't do anything automatically, take a fresh look at each question, and you told me you shouldn't have any problem doing that; is that right?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. Let's talk a little bit about the type witnesses you may hear. I think you indicated in your questionnaire you may have had a brother who's a police officer; is that right?
  - A. That's correct.

- Q. Where was he a police officer?
- A. In Grand Prairie.
- Q. How long was he an officer?
- A. Um, maybe 11 or 12 years as a reserve. He worked for the Dallas County Boys Homes actually.
- Q. The fact that you have somebody in your family close to you, a brother that was a police officer, do you think that would have any bearing on your ability to be fair in this case?
  - A. Shouldn't, no.
- Q. Okay. Obviously, we have alleged a police officer has been murdered in this case. I just want to make sure that that, you know, wouldn't weigh into your consideration at all, your personal experience or friendship or anything like that?
  - A. No.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. What the law, basically, says is that no matter what type witness comes in here, be it a police officer, doctor, or anything else, the jurors kind of have to start them out at that same level of credibility. Does that make sense to you?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. You can't give them a leg up just because they walk in wearing a gun and a badge. You know, once they start testifying, you may want to give them more

credibility. You may want to give them less credibility.

But you have got to start everybody out at the same level,
including police officers. And it doesn't look like it
would be a problem for you at all?

A. No.

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Typically in these type cases you may hear from psychiatrists or psychologists. Either side may call them. So it's kind of important that we, you know, talk to you and get your thoughts about what you think about that type of evidence, mental health professionals.

We talk to a lot of people in these cases and I guess they kind of break down into three different groups. You know, you have got the people that come in and say, you know, I don't trust them as far as I can throw them. They are worthless. I'm not going to listen to a word out of their mouth. You have got the opposite end of the spectrum, you know, they think they walk on water. No matter what --

- A. Put me right in the middle.
- Q. And that's what the law anticipates. That's what the law envisions. You have people right in the middle. Start them out on that same level. If they make sense, give them credibility. If they don't, just disregard their testimony. Does that make sense to you?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. We have kind of touched on this already and you have been down here before, but, obviously, we have the burden of proof at this table. We have got to prove to you his guilt beyond a reasonable doubt and Special Issue 1 and 2. This side and, obviously, they have a different view of the evidence than we do. But they never have the burden and the burden never shifts. Does that make sense to you?
  - A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Okay. And he's presumed innocent. As he sits here right now, you know, if the trial is over right now, you would be required to vote not guilty. You haven't heard any evidence. You know, that presumption of innocence attaches right now and legally he sits there an innocent man. Does that make sense to you?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. As part of those, the presumption of innocence and our burden of proof, you know, we have to prove each and every element of the offense. Okay? That's that indictment you read, you know, the two paragraphs?
  - A. Right.
- Q. They're broken down into different elements of the crime. You know, we have to prove on a certain day -- on or about a certain day in Dallas County a certain person was killed a certain way, that type thing.

I'll give you a crazy hypothetical we throw

out sometimes. We talk to a lot of people about this. You know, let's say our indictment said that a person was stabbed to death. Okay? And it gets to trial and you listen to the evidence. The medical examiner comes in and surprises the DA who don't do our homework and he says, he wasn't stabbed. He was shot. That's what killed him.

Okay? Then we missed an element of our crime.

A. Yeah.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. You may not like it. You may be mad at us.

  I'd be fired and out of a job, if I was that negligent. But under the law you would be required to find the defendant not guilty, because we failed to prove an element to you beyond a reasonable doubt.
  - A. Right.
  - Q. Does that make sense?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. A lot of people consider it a technicality, but it really is important. We have to prove, you know, each and every one. We can't go nine for ten. You know, we have to go ten for ten. Does that make sense to you?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Another example we use sometimes, I know you have at least some contact with Grand Prairie, but some of it is in Tarrant County and some of it is in Dallas County. We allege that a murder happened in the Dallas

County part of Grand Prairie. It comes to trial and the evidence is it happened in Tarrant County. Again, that county is an element. We didn't prove it, you would have to say not guilty. You may not like it. We're going to get fired, but do you think that you can do that?

- A. Oh, yeah.
- Q. Okay. No problem along those lines?
- A. No.

- Q. Again, the defendant has the absolute right not to testify, his Fifth Amendment right. He doesn't have to testify. No one can force him to. No one can keep him off the stand, if he wants to. The important thing to remember is that you can't hold that against him, if he didn't testify. You can't consider it, can't talk about it back there, and it's really just another way of holding us to our burden of proof. Does that make sense to you?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Let me talk to you a little bit about things called lesser included offenses, okay, lesser included offenses. Basically, what that is, is sometimes in a case, you know, the upfront guilt part of the case, jurors may have different options. You maybe convict him of capital murder, convict him of the lesser included offense of murder, or find him not guilty. So murder would be a lesser included offense of capital murder. Does that make sense to

you? Yeah. Q. `` Say we prove the person caused the death, but they weren't a police officer. Would you repeat that again? 0. Hold on just a second. Your question before that was murder is less Α. than capital murder, right? 0. Uh-huh. Α. 10 Okay. Q. They're called lesser included offenses. 11 Murder would be a lesser --12 Α. Lesser than capital. 13 -- included of capital murder. 14 Q. If you allege murder in the course of robbery, robbery would be a lesser 15 included offense of murder. 16 17 Α. Right. 18 Say the person did the robbery, but they didn't actually cause the death, so aggravated robbery could 19 be a lesser included, too. 20 Α. 21 Okay. 22

Q. What the law says is that we need to make sure that all the potential jurors are qualified and can keep an open mind to the full range of punishment for any possible lesser included offenses that could come up, whether it be

23

24

murder or aggravated robbery or that type thing.

I'll just ask you now, talking about the lesser included of robbery, aggravated robbery, the punishment range is anywhere from five years all the way up to 99 years or life for aggravated robbery. Again, the law contemplates or envisions that potential jurors go into this process with an open mind and be able to say, you know, I could keep an open mind to the low end of punishment, I could keep an open mind to the high end of the punishment, depending on the facts and circumstances. Does that make sense to you?

A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Because, I mean, you can commit a murder or you can commit a robbery many different ways under many different sets of facts, even if it's a lesser included of capital murder. Does that make sense to you?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Do you think that you can keep an open mind to that full range of punishment --
  - A. Yes.
- Q. -- for the lesser included offense of aggravated robbery?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. As I have told you, once a person is convicted of capital murder -- I don't think I have told you this, but

there's two possible punishments. You know, if the questions are answered yes, yes, and no, it's a death sentence. If the questions are answered any other way, it's an automatic life sentence.

One way to look at it is, if a person is convicted of capital murder, he's kind of sitting on a life sentence. And only if the questions are answered yes, yes, and no will they go ahead and the death penalty be imposed. Does that make sense to you?

A. Yeah.

Q. Okay. You will be told, if you are a juror in this case, that what a life sentence means is forty years day for day without the possibility of parole. After forty years, forty hard years, a person convicted of capital murder would become eligible for parole. Doesn't mean they would get it. They would just be eligible. They may actually serve out a true life sentence. You just never know.

We tell you that and then the law requires that you not consider it. Okay? We tell you what it is typically, right?

- A. Yeah.
- Q. The law of lawyers. Let me see if I can make it make sense to you. You know, we talked about kind of people having mental discipline and really working through

these questions, you know, we don't want people saying, gee, forty years, that's long enough, so I'm just going to go ahead and give them a life sentence.

And we don't -- conversely, we don't want people saying forty years, that's not long enough. I never want to get him out of prison, so I'm not going to work through the questions. I'm just going to go ahead and give them the death sentence. Does that make sense to you?

A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. It's really just a way of reenforcing that mental discipline to work through the questions. So, you know, the bottom line question is in order to be able to follow the law and be a qualified juror is, you know, knowing that life means forty, could you kind of put that out of your mind and just consider a life sentence to be a life sentence? Could you do that?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. Wouldn't have any problems along those lines?
  - A. No.
- Q. Okay. Mr. Shannon, do you have any questions of me about capital murder or any of the things we talked about?
  - A. No.
- Q. You said that you had some friends that were attorneys; is that right?

Yeah. Α. Any of them criminal attorneys or practice Q٠, criminal law? A. Some acquaintances. 0. Okay. Any names that you can think of? Α. Um, let's see. I can't think of my neighbor's name now. Q. Must not be too close to him, huh? No, I don't see him that often. I tell you why I ask that question. I left 10 11 somebody on the jury one time who was college roommates with 12 the defense attorney who was trying the case and they didn't tell me that. So I make sure I ask now. If you ever think 13 of who your neighbor is -- do you think he practices 14 criminal law? 15 Α. Yeah, here in Dallas. 16 Okay. You are retired now; is that right? 17 Q. Right. Α. 18 Q. And where did you work? 19 Α. I worked for aircraft companies, different 20 aircraft companies. 21 Q. Okay. As a toolmaker; is that right? 22 23 Α. Toolmaker supervisor. Q. What do you do now that you are retired? 24 25 Α. Now that the kids are off the golf course,

going back to school. I plan on going back out there. You also do some fishing; is that right? Exactly. Q. What type of fishing do you do? Т Α. Let's see, I'm going deepsea fishing next week off of Florida. 0. Any questions or concerns about going into this process or anything we haven't talked about? A. The time frame is good for me. Q. Once I finish talking to you here in another 10 minute, Ms. Busbee or Mr. Sanchez is going to visit with 11 12 you. Do me a favor. If you think of your neighbor's name, let me know? 13 I'll be thinking about it before I leave and Α. 14 I'll give it to you. 15 16 Q. Just raise your hand and tell one of them. Α. Okay. 17 Q. 18 Give me just a second. Mr. Shannon, thank you 19 for your time. 20 MR. WIRSKYE: That's all I have, Judge. 21 MS. BUSBEE: May it please the Court. 22 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. BUSBEE: 23 24 Okay. Mr. Shannon, I don't live in your neighborhood or Mr. Sanchez, do we? 25

- A. No.
- Q. Okay. I just wanted to make Mr. Wirskye feel better. He just went through a lot of questions with you that were kind of yes and no questions. It didn't get me anywhere because I don't feel like I know you very well yet.
  - A. Okay.

Q. You said that -- in your questionnaire that in certain circumstances a life sentence might be appropriate in a capital murder case instead of the death sentence. And now, while you probably already knew this, refreshing your memory, you know that a capital murder conviction doesn't mean a death sentence by any means.

Do you have any thoughts on what sort of things, what sort of things would factor into your decision as to whether someone should get a life sentence or death sentence? I don't think you elaborated upon that in the questionnaire and I wonder if you have given it much thought since.

- A. I haven't given it much thought and I'm probably not going to be very creative in that area for you.

  If you have some suggestions, I may agree with them.
- Q. Okay. We need to put you on the jury. Let me ask you some questions about this, then. When you found out, you know, what kind of case you were going to be on or that you were going to be on this case, which, I guess, is

some notoriety, I suppose, particularly since Grand Prairie and Irving are kind of close, did you think that you had already formed some opinions as to what you knew happened in this case?

A. Probably.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Okay. Could you tell us what those might be?
- A. Um, just opinions -- about him being guilty?
- Q. Well, any opinion that you have. I didn't want to put any words in your mouth, but we all have them and you strike me as a man who has strong opinions.
- A. In some areas, yeah, I do. But I didn't dwell on it that long, you know. I read it, saw it in the media a couple of years ago.
- Q. Okay. Fair enough. You made some comments --well, I'll come back to that in a minute. You said that your brother was an auxiliary cop, but he also was -- had a social worker degree or something like that?
- A. Right. He worked for the Dallas County Boys Home.
  - Q. How long was he employed doing that?
  - A. Probably about 20, 25 years.
- Q. Did you ever have occasion to go out there or help him or assist in any activities out there?
- A. Let's see, he took a bunch of kids to a camp one time and I volunteered and went up and cooked for them.

- Q. You weren't necessarily involved in any of his activities at the boys home?
- A. No. That one instance is what I can remember.

  I think that was some camp they had up in Texoma, Lake

  Texoma.
- Q. When your brother worked as an auxiliary police officer, did he perform the same duties as a regular police officer? Did he go with the police officers? That can mean different things. Was he commissioned as a peace officer?
  - A. I don't know.
  - Q. Did he carry a gun when he was --
  - A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. I know that you mentioned that you have been on two juries, but you weren't the foreman. Would you characterize those as pleasant experiences?
- A. Some parts of it, you know. You get a rewarded feeling. Some -- let's see, there was one where in the voir dire stage there was one of the guys that, you know, after when we were deciding whether guilt or innocence and he said -- he kept saying, nobody seen him do it. Well, that's what they asked you about two weeks ago, you know. So that was an unpleasant experience.
- Q. And, see, that's what I'm trying to get to with you. I can't get a feel for you very much because you

know how you feel about things and are definitely certain about them, but I'm not getting a feeling for it. Obviously, we have lots and lots of people here to choose from and I just kind of want to see where your mindset is, see if you are somebody we would want to serve on this jury. I noticed that you said on this previous case where you had been in the hot seat once before that you saw it on television, his reaction to the verdict. I think they know what case it is, but I'm not privy to that, so 10 could you tell us what you saw on television? The case was a Garland officer that was shot 11 Α. and killed. And the guy, when he found out he was guilty, 12 he was cussing the Judge out and, you know, do you remember 13 that one now? 14 Q. Well --15 THE COURT: You didn't narrow it down 16 very much. 17 18 Ο. (By Ms. Busbee) He didn't throw anything at him, did he? 19 20 Α. I think he was trying to get to several of them. 21 Q. Well, no, but now that you mention, I do 22 Didn't it happen in a bank or something like 23 that? 24

Α.

25

Yes.

Q. I remember that. I wasn't involved in that. Now, we talked about it or Mr. Wirskye talked to you about the various different types of capital murder and you know this. Capital murder can be the intentional killing of a child under six, murder in the course of a robbery, murder of a fireman in the course of his or her duties.

Do you think that when someone has been found guilty of, say, killing a police officer, fireman, child under six, that the death penalty is something that they should receive automatically?

- A. After they have been convicted?
- Q. Yes.

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. Um, not necessarily.
- Q. Okay. Because, obviously, those are the kind of cases that make emotions run high and everybody is mad when a child gets killed and a police officer gets killed and a fireman and that's one of the reasons that the law is more severe for that sort of an offense.

Now, the problem is because the emotions are high on that type of case, the courts have drawn up these questions and the Legislature has -- well, the Court has given us guidelines and the Legislature has come up with this scheme of things to make sure that jurors don't just act on their emotions, but rationally make decisions so that the death penalty won't be administered with, you know, rage

or passion, but with -- based on facts and deliberation with members of the community.

So I think we have covered probability pretty well with Mr. Wirskye. But I'm not too sure about your feelings about Special Issue No. 3. Talking about a hypothetical death penalty case and not about this particular case at all, in a case where you have found someone guilty of the offense of capital murder as a party and not the person who actually committed the offense, but participated in it, if you felt that that person was -there's a probability that person would be dangerous in the future, which is Special Issue No. 1, and that you felt like that person anticipated, not just should have, but anticipated someone was going to get killed and you answered that yes, too, would there be anything else that could be shown to you that would make you say despite the fact that I have found beyond a reasonable doubt that he knew it was going to happen and he was a future danger, I think that a life sentence is more appropriate than a death sentence?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. I don't know. I guess I would hear all of that during the stage of the trial and formulate that opinion.
- Q. Okay. So your mind would be open to considering this -- this is what we call kind of a safety valve. I have found that, I have found this, and that would

be the death penalty except for I don't think this individual should receive the death penalty. That's kind of briefly stated how that works.

- A. Right.
- Q. Would you -- are you open to that?
- A. Sure.
- Q. Do you have anything -- I hate asking this, because I know it puts you on the spot, but do you have anything in your mind that you think might be mitigating in a mythical case, not the one we're here on now?
  - A. No.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. It's kind of hard to say. Is there anything that we haven't asked you about? You know, you talked about the juror who failed to raise his hand and talk about something and then it caused a big problem back in the jury room. Is there anything that you think is important about you or your feelings or anything that we should have asked you and we didn't ask you?
- A. You probably should have had a newspaper out there and probably offered me a drink of water. Everybody else has got one.
- Q. I agree with you there. I don't know why we don't do that. You are the one having to do all the talking. How is our how-are-we-doing questionnaire?

MR. WIRSKYE: Permission to approach the

juror? THE COURT: You may. Thank you, sir. (By Ms. Busbee) Other than the service, then, is there anything that we should have asked you that you would like to comment on? Α. No, ma'am. MS. BUSBEE: I'll pass this juror, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Mr. Shannon, if you would, please wait for us outside and give us a few minutes and 11 we'll have you back in and let you know if you will be on 12 this jury or not. 13 14 [Prospective juror out] 15 THE COURT: Mr. Wirskye, what says the State? 16 17 MR. WIRSKYE: State has no challenge for cause, Your Honor. 18 19 MS. BUSBEE: If -- may we have a minute, Your Honor? 20 21 THE COURT: What says the defense as far as challenge for cause? Cause or not? Do you have a 22 challenge for cause? 23 24 MS. BUSBEE: No, Your Honor. 25 THE COURT: Now, would you like to have a

minute? Would you like to step into your office? MS. BUSBEE: Yes. (Recess) THE COURT: Mr. Wirskye, what says the State? MR. WIRSKYE: State will accept the juror. MS. BUSBEE: Defense will strike. THE COURT: Defense exercises peremptory strike No. 1. Ask Mr. Shannon to come back in, please. 10 [Prospective juror in] 11 THE COURT: Mr. Shannon, we apologize for 12 the service this morning in court. We do better in trial, I 13 can tell you that. You are zero for two. You are not going 14 to serve on this jury. We appreciate your time and your 15 participation. Thank you very much. (Recess) 17 18 THE COURT: Sheriff, Ms. Holcombe. you. You may be seated. Good afternoon, Ms. Holcombe, how 19 are you? 20 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Fine. THE COURT: Have you had enough time to 22 review the orientation guide? 23 24 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, uh-huh. THE COURT: I'm not going to go over 25

anything other than try to relax a little bit. Sometimes it can be a little intimidating when you were here last in a room with 800 people with you and we didn't have eye to eye contact. And you know that you filled out the questionnaire and I remind you that you are still under oath here today. As we said, just tell the truth. That's all the lawyers want. If you don't understand the questions or don't understand what it means, that's the opportunity for a give and take.

So the objective is for you to understand the law. That's the long and short of it, understand the law and then they will ask you your opinions based on the law. Once again, any questions of me or the attorneys, just let us know.

Now, I've given you the outline for the trial date we anticipate shall begin on November 10th.

Would you have any problems serving the Court for those two weeks?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: With that, I'll turn it over to Mr. Shook. If you would, please try to remember to say yes or no to any answers to questions because she has to record everything that you say.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.

THE COURT: Mr. Shook.

MR. SHOOK: May it please the Court?

BARBARA HOLCOMBE,

having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

## BY MR. SHOOK:

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Q. Ms. Holcombe, I'll ask you questions on behalf of the State this afternoon. I want to start out by expressing our appreciation for you taking the time to fill out the questionnaire. I know it asks for a lot of information, but it's quite helpful to us and you may not believe it or not, but it speeds up this process a little bit.

What I'll do is ask you questions on the information that you provided us here in the questionnaire. We'll talk about the death penalty, capital murder, and the laws that apply and laws that apply in every type of case. And what we're looking for is just your honest opinions.

You have been on several juries before, so you are somewhat familiar with the process, although this process is a little different from other jury selections.

As I'm sure you well remember, usually the juries are selected from a large group of people with the lawyers speaking to them. But because this is a capital murder case in which the State is seeking the death penalty, the law

allows us to have this individual discussion with each juror. Okay? If you have any questions at any time, feel' free to ask. All right? Okay. Q. Looking at your background, you work for the American Heart Association? Α. Yes. ο. What is it you do with them exactly? I'm a manager of applicant services. A. 10 essence I manage a unit that talks to potential applicants 11 MDs, PhDs, and then we receive the grant applications from 12 them and take them through a detailed process through what 13 we call peer review where a scientific group reviews them 14 and grades them. 15 Q. 16 Okay. And you manage that and have a staff of 17 -- is it three people? 18 Α. Right. Q. That work under your supervision? 19 Α. Uh-huh. 20 And your husband works for the Bureau of Q. 21 Citizenship and Border Protection which, I guess, is part of 22 the Homeland Security now? 23 A. Right. 24 Q. What are his duties with them? 25

He's an immigration inspector, so he works at the DFW Airport, in essence, as the port of entry doing immigration inspection on people coming in from international flights. I recall that somewhere in the questionnaire it looked like he had some training, some type of law enforcement training? Right. Α. Is he a law enforcement officer with his duties? 10 Yes. He's considered a federal law 11 enforcement officer. 12 Q. Does he carry a weapon? 13 Α. Yes, he does, uh-huh. 14 15 0. And he works out at the airport? 16 Α. Yes. He's been pretty busy, I guess, with the Q. 17 events of the last two years? 18 Well, he's -- this is a new position, so he's Α. 19 actually only been at the airport since about April. 20 What was he doing prior to that? 21 0. A. Substitute teaching in the Rockwall School 22 District. 23 24 Q. Okay. So he's just recently become part of

that?

Α. Uh-huh. Does he enjoy that type of work? Um, yes. Okay. Now, I wanted to talk to you a little bit about your jury service. You have been, it looks like, on a DWI, sexual assault that involved a minor -- was the defendant a juvenile or was the victim the minor? Α. It seems to me -- I mean, when it came to trial she was 12 or 13 and the occurrence was several years 10 earlier. 0. The victim was? 11 Α. Uh-huh. 12 Q. So was that trial down here at this 13 courthouse? 14 Do you recall? I believe so, yes. 15 A. Q. 16 Okay. So the defendant wasn't a minor. was the victim herself. And --17 18 Α. Right. And then you've been on some type of 19 Q. termination of parental rights case; is that right? 20 Α. My husband was. 21 22 Q. Your husband was? Uh-huh. 23

> 283RD JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT 214/653-5863 NANCY BREWER, OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

24

25

Q.

finding. That was back in the '80s?

The DWI, I believe you said, was a guilty

Α. Yes. Would the -- this case involving the sexual Q. assault was in 1995 or thereabouts? Α. Uh-huh. Which resulted in a hung jury? Α. Right. 0. You put some of the information here that some of the problems where I think there were translators involved and that sort of thing? 10 Α. Uh-huh, yes. 11 Q. Ultimately, what happened as far as the deliberations go? 12 Um, I think in essence most of the jury came 13 to a consensus, but we had one person on the jury -- bottom 14 line came down to her not believing a policeperson's 15 testimony. 16 17 Q. Okay. They had some type of bias against police officers? 18 19 A. Uh-huh, right. 20 Q. And it came down to one holdout, that type of thing? 21 Α. Yes. 22 23 Q. Overall, was that a pretty unpleasant experience, then, with one person just holding out based on 24 25 that?

- A. It was. It was, because the jury was very diverse and expressed that diversity in the jury room.

  Q. Did you feel in that case, then, that the State had met its burden of proof?
- A. Um, I have to stop and think about that. Yes, I mean --
- Q. Okay. Another area I want to get into is we obviously ask if you know anyone that's been involved in the criminal justice system and it looked like your son had some problems in the early '90s?
  - A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Some type of counterfeiting federal charge?
- A. Uh-huh.
- Q. Tell us a little bit about that, what all that involved.
- A. Um, well, he was living elsewhere and we -- I'm trying to think how ultimately why we knew about it.
  - Q. So he wasn't living here in the city?
- A. He wasn't living at our home. He was living, you know, with his girlfriend and in another part of the city.
  - Q. Okay.
- A. And I guess at some point we were contacted about it and he -- he had used a computer to copy U.S. currency and had actually given it to some friends and they

had distributed it.

Q. All right. And did he even

- Q. All right. And did he eventually go to some type of detention center --
  - A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. -- for some time?
- A. Yes. He went to a federal -- I can't remember what it's called -- in Texarkana, a federal prison there for a year and a half.
- Q. Okay. And I think you said that he had had some drug problems in the past. Was this around the same time period?
  - A. Earlier, yes.
- Q. Okay. What's his situation now? Has that all been resolved?
- A. He's living in Oklahoma City and he's employed with Sprint there in Oklahoma City.
- Q. What was your take on his experience with the criminal justice system? Do you think that he was treated fairly?
  - A. Ultimately, yes.
- Q. When you say "ultimately", what do you mean by that?
- A. Well, as a parent you have very mixed feelings. He went -- he had several misdemeanors, so he went through the system in different ways at different

times. And -- but, as I say, ultimately I felt he was dealt with fairly.

- Q. Okay. Let me turn your attention now to the death penalty capital murder and ask you how you feel about that. You put on your questionnaire that you are in favor of it as a law. Since filling out the questionnaire, you probably have had some more time to think about it. I just want you to express in your own feelings how you feel about the death penalty. Do you agree with it, do you think that we should have the death penalty for certain cases?
- A. I think that we should. And other than that, of course, I think it depends upon the individual circumstance.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. What purpose do you think the death penalty serves?
- A. Um, I think it truly in some cultures, I'm not sure in our culture, in some cultures it may be a deterrent of some type. And, you know, I feel under that certain heinous crime that it would be appropriate for.
- Q. Okay. Is the death penalty a law that you have always been in favor of since you were an adult?
- A. I don't know that I've had to make that decision until I was presented with your questionnaire.
- Q. Not something that you really thought about that often?

A. Right.

- Q. Have you ever followed any cases in the media that you thought were appropriate for the death penalty case or capital murder case?
  - A. Um, I mean, not deliberately, no.
- Q. Okay. In Texas there are only certain crimes which can be prosecuted for the death penalty. It has to be an intentional killing and it has to be during some -- carried out during some aggravated facts, is what we call it, during the course of another felony. Someone goes in and robs a convenience store clerk and murders them, that could be a death penalty case. Someone breaks into someone's home, someone commits a capital murder then, that could be a death penalty case. If you murder someone during the course of a kidnapping or during a rape, that could also be a death penalty case, or during an arson.

Also, there are certain individuals, victims, such as a police officer on duty, fireman on duty, prison guard on duty, those could be death penalty cases. Child under the age of six is murdered intentionally, that could be a death penalty case. Murder of more than one person in the same transaction or a serial killer situation could be. And also murder of someone for hire. Someone does it for money or if you hire someone to go murder someone for money, pay them, that could be a death penalty situation.

But those are the specific types of crimes that we reserve for the death penalty. There are lots of other brutal murders, which the most the person would get would be a life sentence, but could not get the death penalty.

Those types of crimes I've gone over, do you feel those are the types of cases which should be considered for the death penalty?

- A. Um, I guess I would say generally, yes.
- Q. Any reservations on any of those types of crimes?

- A. Um, only with the same thought that it would always come down to the individual circumstances.
- Q. Okay. In Texas when we think of what a death penalty case is or capital murder, we can't go over the facts of the case, obviously, but what we -- generally people think of is the situation where someone goes in and, let's say, murders a 7-Eleven clerk or something, the actual triggerman. Obviously, that type of person can be prosecuted for the death penalty.

But sometimes more than one person commits a crime or more than one person may be involved in the crime. Sometimes it takes more than one person to commit a crime. Groups of people can go in and commit a crime. Some may have different roles. Some may be more

actively involved. But if they were all actively involved in helping one another, the law says they can all be prosecuted for that crime, even though some may have a more active role in it.

The same is true for capital murder. An example we give is a bank robbery. Let's say Mr. Wirskye and I here decide we want to rob a bank. If we go into the bank and I have the guns and he has a bag for the money, I make the threats, hold the guns on people, he goes to the tellers and takes the money out of the drawer. And during the course of that robbery, I shoot one of the tellers and murder them.

We flee the bank, we are arrested.

Obviously, I can be prosecuted for capital murder. I could receive the death penalty because I'm the triggerman. The law says that Mr. Wirskye can also be prosecuted for capital murder because he was assisting me and he was helping me carry out that crime. Ultimately, he could get the death penalty, depending on the facts.

Some people, though, when we talk about the death penalty, draw a line there with the accomplices. We call them parties or the law of parties. If it were up to them, they have no problem with the death penalty for the person who actually causes the death or the triggerman, but they do have reservations or they are personally opposed to

the death penalty for someone who assists in a crime, an accomplice.

Other people agree with the law, recognizing that even if they are not the triggerman, depending on the facts, you could be prosecuted for the death penalty and ultimately receive it.

But I like to ask people how they feel generally about that. There aren't any right or wrong answers. How do you feel about that law? Do you feel it's a fair law to be able to prosecute accomplices for capital murder and ultimately receive the death penalty or is that something that you would really reserve a different type of punishment for?

- A. I think, generally, I would think it's a fair law.
- Q. And why do you think it's fair to prosecute others involved in a capital murder that aren't the actual triggerman?
- A. Because I'm assuming that if they are involved in the planning and know that this is a possibility of, you know, the ultimate outcome, that they are, in essence, accepting the risk.
- Q. Okay. That's kind of what the law says.

  There's two ways we can prove it. One is the facts show and you can draw all the intent from the facts that the person

is actively participating, aiding, maybe if they planned it or they are actively there helping in the offense, that could be one way to do it.

And the other is called conspiracy or party conspiracy. If Mr. Wirskye and I agreed to commit aggravated robbery, we robbed the bank, and from the facts -- and, say, I went ahead and committed murder in furtherance of that conspiracy, in other words, I shot one of the tellers to get away or just during the course of that felony, the law says that all the parties involved should be held responsible if they should have anticipated that something like that could happen.

My fact situation, Mr. Wirskye knows I have guns, maybe he knows what I'm like, and kind of what your reasoning was, they kind of assumed that might happen. And that's what we have to prove, they anticipated a life could be taken.

In order to get them guilty, we don't even have to prove that they wanted that to happen. Now, to get the death penalty, we have to eventually prove that they did anticipate something would happen. But it goes along those lines that you talked about. They don't have to be the actual triggerman, but if they agreed to commit one crime and another crime was carried out, then the law holds them responsible. It's a way, I guess, of deterring people

from committing these types of offenses.

What I hear you saying is you are in agreement with the law of parties --

A. Yes.

Q. -- and could do that? Okay. Now, under our procedures the trial would take -- would proceed the same in any capital murder case. You have the guilt/innocence stage where the State must prove its case beyond a reasonable doubt. If we do that, we don't stop. We go to the punishment phase where you can hear additional evidence. You may or may not hear additional evidence, but you can hear additional background information and that sort of thing.

And at the close of that, the jury then gets these Special Issues to look at and we'll go over these in more detail in a moment. But basically, Special Issue No. 1, the State has to prove the defendant will be a continuing danger to society. Special Issue No. 2, we have to prove that he either caused the death or if he didn't, if he was a party, that he anticipated someone could be killed. And Special Issue No. 3 is the mitigating evidence issue in that you look at all the facts of the case and decide is there sufficient mitigating evidence that a life sentence should be imposed, rather than a death sentence. And those questions are answered yes and no.

and no, the Judge has no choice, he would sentence the defendant to death. If the questions are answered any other way, again, he would have no choice and he would sentence the defendant to life in prison. But those are the two choices once someone has been found guilty of a crime. It's a death sentence or a life sentence and that's based just on how the jury answers those questions. Is that clear to you?

A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Are you aware of the method of execution in Texas?
  - A. Um, not really.
- Q. Okay. It's by lethal injection. It used to be by the electric chair, but they changed it several years ago. The procedures are the same in each case. Sometimes, depending on the case, some will get a lot of news coverage, which you may or may not have seen. I don't know.

The procedures are the same. If the defendant is convicted and these questions are answered in that way and the Judge sentences him to death, he would be put on death row. He would wait there a number of years. At some point in time the Judge would actually issue a date of execution.

On that day or the day before that date, he would be taken from death row and put in the prison unit

that is in downtown Huntsville where all executions take place. On the date of his execution he would be given an opportunity to meet with his family, friends, or a minister. He would be given a last meal.

But at 6:00 p.m. all executions take place under our law. He would be taken to the execution chamber. He would be placed on a gurney. He would be secured there by leather straps and needles would be placed in his arm. Witnesses would come into the viewing rooms. There are witnesses there for the defendant and there's witnesses there for the victim's family, if they choose to be there.

Once they are there, the warden moves forward with the execution. The condemned is allowed a last statement and after he finishes that last statement a signal is given and lethal substances are then placed in his body which shut down his heart and lungs. Death occurs very quickly. Oftentimes the news covers this. They go over the defendant's last words, maybe the family's last words, that sort of thing.

That -- and I don't mean to be morbid,
but I want to lay all our cards on the table, too. This is
a death penalty case in which we are actively seeking the
death penalty. It's a case in which we feel we have the
type and quality of evidence to convince the jury of the

defendant's guilt and that these questions would be answered in such a way which would result in his execution some day.

And in Texas executions actually do happen. You may be aware that there are some states that have capital murder, they prosecute people, and put them on death row, but the executions rarely take place. Texas actually leads the nation in executions. So we're talking about a punishment that ultimately will be carried out.

You've told us that philosophically you feel that the death penalty is appropriate for some cases, all depending on the facts?

A. Right.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. You told us that you agree with the law of parties that accomplices can be prosecuted and they can get the death penalty, again, depending on the facts?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And what I need to know is this, as best you know yourself, do you feel you are the type of person that could listen to this evidence and then make this decision and if we do actually prove these things to you beyond a reasonable doubt, you could take pen in hand and answer those questions in a way, knowing that when you do, some day the defendant would be executed in the manner I've described?
  - A. Yes.

Q. Okay. We just depend on your honesty and I appreciate your candor on that, ma'am. Let's talk a little bit about these Special Issues. You don't get to these questions, unless you have already found the defendant guilty. But then the law says that you can hear additional evidence, additional background evidence, good and bad. You may or may not. It just depends on the particular case.

This first question, it starts out with a no answer, just like someone starts out with a presumption of innocence, and the State must prove it beyond a reasonable doubt that it should be answered yes. And the question asks whether there's a probability that the defendant would commit criminal acts of violence that would constitute a continuing threat to society. It's asking the jurors to make a prediction about the defendant's future behavior.

Do you feel comfortable answering a question like that, if you are given sufficient facts or evidence?

A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

- Q. Okay. What types of information would you want to know? What would be important to you in answering that type of question?
  - A. The history, background.
  - Q. Someone has had a background or that sort of

thing?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- A. Uh-huh.
- Q. That's the answer we most often get. People want to know if there's a pattern, that sort of thing, something like this may have occurred before.
  - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. Now, if that type of information exists, we can present it. We can actually present the witnesses. There are some capital murders where really the only evidence the jury has is the facts of the crime itself alone. The person may not have an extensive history. That doesn't prevent us from prosecuting that person for capital murder. And the jury may have only the facts of the offense alone to decide that, if they are a continuing danger.

Do you feel the facts of the offense could give you enough information about an individual that tells you that they are dangerous, again, depending on what those facts are?

- A. I'm not sure.
- Q. Okay. Why is that?
- A. I do think most of us look to patterns and history, probably.
- Q. Okay. So that would be the most important factor to you? The reason I say that is maybe a person may not -- maybe they were a Boy Scout their whole life, but

then they commit some horrible capital murder, maybe a very brutal crime. And then the jury would really only have, well, hasn't done anything or hasn't been caught on anything, but, boy, this is a horrible crime. Can that give me enough facts, maybe the planning or how brutal it was, what they did afterwards, that could tell you that person would be a continuing danger?

Some people tell us no, they would actually require a criminal history. Other people tell us no, no, I could see someone who maybe they committed their first act, but they started out very badly and that could give them enough information, just depending on the actual facts of the case.

How do you feel about that? Is it going to come down to the facts or are you one of those persons that really would require a previous criminal history?

- A. Well, because of the word "probability" to me that really lends itself to looking for patterns and history. So --
- Q. When you see the word "probability" in that question, what does it mean to you?
- A. It means statistical evidence, I guess, that's working with MDs and PhDs, so that's why trends and history would, you know, with that word "probability" seems important to me.

Q. Okay. You will not get any legal definitions in the punishment stage about what these words mean. The definitions would be left up to you and the other jurors. That's why we kind of ask you about them. Probability, obviously, means more than a possibility because anything could be possible. It's certainly less than a certainty, also.

Are you comfortable with probability as it's used in that particular sentence?

- A. Um, yes.
- Q. Make sense to you?
- A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. When you see the words "committing criminal acts of violence", what types of things do you think of?
  - A. Harm to others.
  - Q. Harm to others?
  - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. Could be a murder case, could be some other type of assaultive offense, that sort of thing?
  - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. Okay. And when you see the words "continuing threat to society", what does "society" mean to you?
  - A. The public at large, I guess.
- Q. Okay. Could it also mean people down in the prison system, guards, inmates, teachers, administrators,

that sort of thing?

- A. Uh-huh, yes.
- Q. It could mean anyone anywhere that the defendant may come into contact with?
  - A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Special Issue No. 2, that question gets a little lengthy. I would like you to take a moment and read that to yourself before I ask you a couple of other questions.

That question covers, again, kind of the party situation. It can cover different scenarios. The first part says whether the defendant actually caused the death. If you believe from the evidence he was the actual triggerman, then the question is pretty simple. But we can't get into the facts, but we are prosecuting this case under the theory of parties or that he was not the triggerman. That's why I wanted to go over all that type of law with you.

And that's why this is important, that if you don't believe that he actually caused the death, if he did not actually cause the death of the deceased, but intended to kill the deceased or another, then that is his intent was there, maybe someone else committed the murder, or anticipated that a human life would be taken. And that's what we talked about earlier, kind of what you said in your

own words, they kind of once they entered that situation with someone armed like that, they kind of accepted the responsibility that something could go wrong or happen like that. Do you think this is a good question to have?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Now, you understand that this question goes directly to the parties, that when prosecuting someone under the law of parties, this is what we have to prove that either he had the intent to kill or he did anticipate that a human life would be taken.

In a jury trial we present the evidence and when we are proving someone's intent, oftentimes we can just present the facts and the jurors are allowed to make reasonable deductions from the evidence to look at someone's intent. In other words, we are not always able to say, you know, this is what he intended. We can argue that a person's intentions can be drawn from the actual facts of the case, what they did, what their role in the crime was, that sort of thing.

Do you feel that's a fair way of proving a case, if we're able to present all the facts to you? In other words, do you think, yes, you can draw or learn a person's intentions from the facts of the case, if enough is presented to you?

A. Yes.

- Q. And is that all -- concerning all relevant facts about how a crime was planned and how it was pulled off and that sort of thing?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. You don't have any problem, then, I take it, with Special Issue No. 2 as far as the death penalty case? You feel that, again, that that's a fair law and that the State should be able to prosecute someone under that theory?
  - A. Yes.

Q. That question starts out with a no answer and, again, we have to prove to you that it should be answered yes. It may be the same evidence that you heard in the guilt/innocence stage. You just look at it again and then make that decision did the State prove it to you. And you may also do it on additional background evidence that you learned in the punishment phase that would aid you in answering that question.

But what you have to do is wait. Just because you found the defendant guilty, you don't automatically answer those questions. You have to go back in the jury room, look at the evidence you have already heard and any new evidence you have heard and then decide if the State has proven these two questions. You feel you could do that?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Would you require the State to prove this to you beyond a reasonable doubt?
  - A. State that again?
- Q. That the law says that the State has to prove these questions to you beyond a reasonable doubt, just like we have to prove his guilt. And what I want to ask you is would you be able to follow that law and require us to prove that to you beyond a reasonable doubt?
  - A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Okay. Now, this last question is the Special Issue question. It's the last one you get and neither side has the burden of proof. You don't get to that question until you found the defendant guilty of capital murder, until you have already determined he's a continuing danger to society, and that he either caused the death or anticipated that a death would occur.

And then you look at all the evidence you have heard, the crime itself, and his background evidence and determine if you think there's sufficient mitigating evidence that would call for a life sentence rather than a death sentence.

If you will, just take a moment and read that question. It's the lengthiest one and then we'll go over a few questions.

It's kind of a catch-all or we call it a safety net. It allows the jurors to look at everything in his background and then decide if you think something is sufficiently mitigating.

Now, what mitigating evidence is, I can't tell you. It's up to you and the other jurors. You don't even have to tell us what you think mitigating evidence is or you don't have to agree with the other jurors.

Let me give you an example. You may have a capital murder case where you are sitting as a juror and when you get to this question, the evidence may have shown that the defendant has four PhDs from Harvard. One juror might think that's mitigating. He's done some positive things with his life. May not be sufficient to spare his life, but they may want to look at it that way. Another juror could say actually that's kind of aggravating. You know, someone that has four PhDs shouldn't go around killing people or committing capital murders. I would hold that against him. So it could go either way. It just depends on how you view the evidence and it could be anything.

As you sit there today, can you give us any indication or anything you might believe could be potentially mitigating evidence that you would consider?

A. Not really. I mean -- that statement, in essence, if that's what the Judge says the jury is to look

at --

- Q. Right. Consider all of that.
- A. Right.
- Q. Don't feel bad because I ask that question to every juror and I would say 99 percent say, not really. It's not an issue you usually wouldn't think about. It's just basically whatever you think could be mitigating. We go over some things with jurors. Sometimes you consider a person's background, how they were raised. Maybe they were raised in poverty. Maybe they came from a broken home. Some jurors feel that's potentially mitigating. Other jurors tell us, no. A lot of people were raised in that environment.

You may hear about physical or mental abuse of a person as they grew up. Some people believe that's potentially mitigating, depending on the severity.

Other people tell us I feel bad for them, but that happens a lot and once you are an adult you have to be held accountable.

Sometimes you hear about drug use. Some people feel that could be mitigating and other people say, if they are voluntarily taking drugs, no, no, that's not.

How do you feel about those types of issues? Do you view that as potentially mitigating or something you might be open to it? How do you feel about

that?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. In a very general way, I don't think those are mitigating circumstances in my mind.
  - Q. Just something you would have to hear?
  - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. That's all the law says. You don't have to think of what is mitigating. All you have to be able to tell the Court is I'll keep my mind open to it. If I feel something sufficiently mitigating where I think a life sentence should be imposed, I'll answer the question that way. If I don't, I'm going to answer it no.

But you have to be able to keep your mind open to it, even though you have already found them guilty, even though you already feel he's a continuing danger or anticipated that someone would die, you can keep your mind open and then answer the question yes or no, just depending on the facts. Do you feel that you can do that?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Fair enough. There's another area that may or may not come up. In any case you have the jury considers lesser included offenses at times. A lesser included offense of capital murder where we have alleged robbery, is aggravated robbery, taking someone's property at gunpoint. You may have a reasonable doubt about the defendant causing the death, but maybe not about robbery.

In those situations you might find the defendant guilty of aggravated robbery.

Now, if you found the defendant guilty of aggravated robbery instead of capital murder, the punishment range changes completely. You don't get these questions. You just get a penalty range for years in prison. One end is a life sentence or 99 years and the other end is five years in prison and anywhere in between.

You get to hear all the background evidence and then you decide what is appropriate. If you think a life sentence would be appropriate, you could do that based on the facts, 50 years, 30 years, or as little as five years in prison.

Again, all you have to be able to do is assure the Judge that you can keep your mind open to that full range, consider it, and if you think the right thing to do based on the evidence is give a life sentence, you could do that, or as little as five years in prison, you could do that or anywhere in between, just based on what the evidence tells you to do.

Do you feel you can keep your mind open to that full range of punishment in an aggravated robbery situation?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. There are some rules that apply to each

case and you will be familiar with these because you grew up here, for one thing, and they are taught in school, most of them, and, also, you have been on two juries so you have probably heard these before.

The presumption of innocence, the Judge covered some of these with the general voir dire. The defendant starts out a trial, he's presumed to be innocent and the State overcomes that presumption by putting on evidence. But when you begin, just because the defendant has been arrested, indicted, or even we're going through this process, that's not evidence of his guilt. You have to wait for us to actually produce the evidence and then make your decision. Could you do that?

A. Yes.

Q. The burden of proof never shifts. The defense does not have to put on evidence. They very well may. In fact, most people assume they will, but they are not required to. That burden of proof always stays with the State. At the close of our case, if they haven't asked any questions or put on any evidence and you have that reasonable doubt, then you simply must find the defendant not guilty, if you don't think we have met our burden.

Could you do that and keep the burden of proof on the State of Texas?

A. Yes.

Q. That burden of proof goes to the indictment. We have to prove every portion of the indictment. If you have a reasonable doubt just on one element of it, one part of it, you are obligated to find the defendant not guilty. Could you do that?

A. Yes.

Q. Give you a small example. One of the elements we allege is the county it occurred in, Dallas County. If we even failed to prove Dallas County, some view that as a technicality, but the law doesn't. You would have to find him not guilty. I don't anticipate that would happen and if it did, I'm sure we would lose our jobs. But you can't help us out. You just have to be a neutral judge, kind of like a referee. Do you feel that you could do that?

A. Yes.

Q. And then another element or proposition of laws is the Fifth Amendment. If someone chooses to testify, you would judge them like any other witness. If they choose not to testify, though, you can't hold that against them. You have to just judge the case on the evidence you have heard. Could you follow that rule of law?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Now, your husband is in law enforcement now? A lot of jurors, obviously, respect the job the police do. In a criminal case police officers are called to

testify. However, you can't start them out ahead of other witnesses, as far as credibility goes, without hearing them first. You have to wait and judge them like you would any other witness. Do you feel that you can do that?

A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. You recognize there are some good police officers, bad police officers, just like any other profession. Okay?

And one other area, the parole laws get a lot of publicity. In a capital murder situation, if someone is given a life sentence, we can tell you that they have to stay in prison forty calendar years before they become eligible for parole, day for day, forty calendar years. The law, also, the Judge will tell you, that you can't consider the parole laws in your deliberations. You have to assume a life sentence means a life sentence and then just base your answers to these questions on the evidence that you hear. Could you follow that instruction from the Court?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Now, you, like the other jurors in this case, heard some general news sometime back about this crime?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. It received a lot of publicity. Can you tell us what you recall hearing?

- A. Um, I remember hearing generally about the officer's shooting, probably because it was Christmas Eve and received lots of publicity and then over the period of time, following and tracking and ultimately capturing the people.
  - Q. Did you follow any of the subsequent trials?
  - A. No.

Q. All right. Again, when a case receives this much publicity, all the jurors have heard something about it. The law is simply this. Just because you have heard or followed it in the news doesn't make you ineligible to be a juror. What you have to be able to do is -- we can't ask you to forget about what you heard. But just base your decisions on what you hear in the courtroom. In other words, if you remember something different from what you saw on TV from what you heard in the witness box, you, obviously, can only make your decision on what you hear in the courtroom. That's going to be the more accurate information.

Would you be able to follow that instruction and just base your decisions on what you hear in the courtroom and not anything that you read or heard on TV?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Your mind is open, then, and you would still require the State of Texas to prove to you beyond a

reasonable doubt that these allegations are true?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Do you have any questions of me? We've gone over a lot of information here pretty quickly. Any questions at all?
  - A. (Prospective juror shakes head.)
  - Q. Okay. I appreciate your patience.

MR. SHOOK: That's all the questions that I have at this time, Judge.

THE COURT: Ms. Busbee.

MS. BUSBEE: May it please the Court?

## **CROSS-EXAMINATION**

## BY MS. BUSBEE:

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. You don't seem as uncomfortable as some of these other people that we've had up here and I appreciate you talking to us so frankly. Mr. Shook has covered the law very well and so I don't need to go over the same territory. I just have some specific questions for you.

First of all, I know that this law enforcement career for your husband, that's a new one?

- A. Uh-huh.
- Q. But do you think that it may affect you to sit on a jury where a police officer is killed and to look at the evidence in such a way that because your husband serves as a police officer, law enforcement official, that it would

be more upsetting to you and might affect you in some way?

- A. I don't think that I would be, no.
- Q. We gave you a witness list, extensive witness list. Did you have a chance to read over that?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Were there any names on that list that you thought you might know that person?
  - A. No.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. In your questionnaire we asked some general questions about the death penalty and you mention that -- checked that you thought that the death penalty may be misused from time to time. Do you remember answering that or what you were thinking about when you said that? See, what I like about this is we give you the test and then we give you the information. So it's kind of unfair to ask you questions about certain things when you don't really know what you are answering.
  - A. Right.
- Q. I guess -- from this table, I guess what we would like to be sure of is that a juror recognizes that just because someone has been found guilty of a capital murder, that he's not by any means, they are not necessarily going to receive the death penalty, that there are some -- there are narrow, narrow steps that have to be taken before that person can be given the death penalty.

The first one is the probability question that we talked about and the second one is something that can't be answered until you have heard the facts of the case. But assuming that you have heard the facts of the case and the probability of future dangerousness and the intent or anticipation of taking a human life was proved to you beyond a reasonable doubt -- and we don't know at this point what the evidence would be or whether it would satisfy you. But let's say that it does, without even trying to put you -- pin you down to ask you what that might be, could you tell us that you could still consider voting yes on question No. 3, a vote that would result in a life penalty instead of a death penalty?

- A. Yes, I could.
- Q. Is there anything that's on your mind that you think we should talk to you about? We have this set series of questions that we ask, but sometimes there are things that jurors think they should share with us or tell us that might be important that we haven't asked.
  - A. Not that I can think of.
  - Q. Let me consult here with my co-counsel.

MS. BUSBEE: I'll pass the juror, Your

Honor.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: No further questions?

MS. BUSBEE: No, Your Honor.

```
THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am.
    would, I'm going to have you wait outside just for a moment
    and we'll have you back in. Give us just a few minutes.
                             [Prospective juror out]
                        THE COURT:
                                   What says the State?
                       MR. SHOOK: May we have one moment,
    Judge?
                       THE COURT: All right. Find the juror to
    be qualified or not?
10
                       MR. SHOOK: Yes.
                                         We have no grounds for
11
    submission of cause at all, Judge.
12
                       THE COURT: Defense?
13
                       MS. BUSBEE: We have no grounds for
    submission.
14
                       THE COURT: Court finds, also, the juror
15
    to be qualified.
                      What says the State?
16
17
                       MR. SHOOK: State will accept the juror.
                       MS. BUSBEE: The defense will accept the
18
    juror.
19
                       THE COURT: Thank you. You may be
20
    seated.
21
                             [Prospective juror in]
22
                       THE COURT: Ms. Holcombe, I want to
23
    inform you that you have been accepted as a juror in this
24
    case. And we have spent a lot of time with you today.
25
```

have read the orientation guide, we've been over the law, and now this is probably a long period of time, but, once again, just put this in the back of your mind because we'll start this on November 10th.

What will happen is when you go back to your work at the American Heart Association, they are going to be, where have you been today? Because they know where you are, don't they?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Uh-huh.

THE COURT: Sure they do. And if you go back and tell them, well, I've been accepted on this jury, no doubt they are going to tell you their opinions. And you know what? These lawyers in the court are satisfied with your opinions. And because they weren't here today, they have not been through the whole process.

So what you have got to do is just shut it down. I'm going to instruct you, don't lie, you have got to tell your supervisor, but we're far enough out that you can tell your supervisors, I need to schedule these two weeks off. And just say -- just leave it jury duty. Don't be any more specific than that. If they have any questions, tell them they can call me directly and that will cure it. They won't want to do that. All right?

But if you start telling people that you are on this jury, they are going to start talking about it.

One of the instructions that I'm going to give you in writing and I will follow this up and you will have your paper, is you are to receive no information about this case other than from that witness stand right there that you are sitting in now.

So when this -- just don't read anything about it in the paper. If there is a news special, whatever, I don't think there will be, just nothing. You have already told us that -- I remember your words. I'll have to see the evidence for myself to make a decision. That's all we're asking you to do.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.

THE COURT: Do you have any questions for

me?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: All right. So again, schedule your time with work. Don't talk about this. Just kind of put it in the back of your mind. You have plenty of time to plan for it. If you will go with Sheriff Cook, he has a few other items that he needs to take care of at this time.

And you will receive another -- let me tell you what will happen. I don't know the exact date. I anticipate the week prior to November 10th, we'll have all the jurors back down here. But I don't know what day it's

going to be. Sheriff, how long was it, two hours last time, three, for orientation? SHERIFF COOK: It was about two and this one we're planning on an hour or less. THE COURT: It will be about another hour or hour and a half of orientation. That's with the whole group here at once so I can give everybody the same instructions and that will be prior to the 10th and hopefully we'll get that out to you when that would be. 10 you will have one more day down here before testimony will 11 actually begin. 12 If you would, go with the Sheriff and we 13 14 appreciate your time. [Prospective juror out] 15 THE COURT: Mr. Peterson. 16 17 [Prospective juror in] 18 THE COURT: Good afternoon, sir, how are you? 19 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Doing good. 21 THE COURT: And your name is Eugene Alan Peterson? 22 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's correct. 24 THE COURT: I see you brought in the orientation guide. Have you had an opportunity to read that 25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I did. THE COURT: -- with the witness list? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. THE COURT: Very well. I don't have anything at all to add to the guide, other than you understand you will be going through the law and my job is to be sure that you understand the law we'll be using in this case. Please ask questions. This is the only time that you will be able to. If you don't understand the 10 concept the lawyer is trying to explain, say I don't 11 understand, if they can't explain it, I'll try. 12 objective is for you to understand. 13 The only question that I have for you, 14 sir, is, I gave you the timeline, this trial shall begin on 15 the 10th of November. Do you have any problems serving this 16 Court for those two weeks? 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: At this time I don't 18 see a problem. 19 THE COURT: 20 Any questions? 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not yet. THE COURT: Mr. Wirskye? 22 23 MR. WIRSKYE: Thank you, Judge. May it please the Court? 24 EUGENE PETERSON, 25

having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

### DIRECT EXAMINATION

### BY MR. WIRSKYE:

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. Mr. Peterson, how are you this afternoon?
- A. I'm fine.
- Q. My name is Bill Wirskye and I'll be the assistant DA that will be visiting with you for the next few minutes and talk a little bit about some of the information in your questionnaire, how you feel about the death penalty, what your thoughts are there, and follow up a little bit about the law that may apply in this type of case. What exactly do you do for a living?
  - A. I work at a television station.
  - Q. What station is that?
  - A. KDAF, WB 33.
- Q. I notice you said you were a broadcast engineer?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. I hate to show my ignorance, but what exactly does that mean?
- A. Basically, take care of the equipment side of things.
- Q. Do you work on a newscast or any particular programs?

- A. Not directly, you know, it's just generally take care of all the equipment.

  Q. You are not an on-air guy?
  - A. Oh, no.
  - Q. Behind the scenes technical type?
  - A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. I notice -- you probably don't remember this.

  It's a little unfair of us to even refer back to these questionnaires that you filled out, I guess, in May. But on the last page, like so many other people, you said that you would prefer not to be chosen necessarily. And I was just curious what you were thinking when you put that down?
- A. Um, it would be an awesome responsibility, I think.
  - Q. Because of the type of case it is?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And you have told us, I guess, in a very general way that you are in favor of or support the death penalty; is that right?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. Is that a fair statement?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. What value or utility do you see in, you know, the State of Texas, I guess, having a death penalty?
  - A. Well, in a way it's a deterrent because he

won't do it again. But in some cases it's just -- it's justified for society to do that.

- Q. Okay. Kind of an intellectual belief or religious belief or -- just trying to get a grasp of where you are coming from on that.
  - A. Intellectually, I guess.
- Q. Is it something you have been in favor of your adult life?
- A. For most of it, yeah, there was a time when I was younger when I didn't quite believe in it, but --
- Q. You think the older people get, the more conservative they get? At least that applies to me --
  - A. Generally speaking.
- Q. -- I don't know if it applied to you. You said that you had a daughter, I guess, that didn't necessarily agree with the death penalty; is that right?
  - A. That's true, but --
  - Q. Okay. She's how old, 22 or --
  - A. Twenty.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Okay. Is that something that y'all have had discussions about or she feels strongly about or just --
- A. I don't know how strongly she feels, but we don't, you know, discuss it in depth or anything.
- Q. I would hope you wouldn't necessarily, unless you do what we do for a living. But you also said that you

were -- I guess, had read an article, a magazine article, about the death penalty, is that right, "New American Magazine"?

A. Uh-huh.

Q. Can you tell us about that article?

- A. It's been some time. You know, trying to remember the details.
- Q. What type of magazine is that? I hate to show my ignorance, but I'm not necessarily familiar with it.
- A. It's a magazine published by the John Birch Society, so it's quite conservative in most of its viewpoints.
- Q. I notice you consider yourself fairly conservative?
  - A. Uh-huh.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Was it a pro or con article? One way or the other on the death penalty?
- A. It was to dispell the myths behind not having it and why a lot of the reasons people come up with for not having it are not well thought out and not necessarily true.
- Q. Okay. And I guess that article influenced you enough for you to --
  - A. Well, it strengthened my belief.
  - Q. All right. The belief that you already had?
  - A. Uh-huh.

- A. Um, probably any case of a really heinous nature, you know, where somebody was just so totally lacking in concern for human beings that -- sure.
- Q. Any particular case you may have heard about in the news or media that comes to mind when you think about an appropriate case for that type of punishment?
  - A. At this time I can't --

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. That's fine. I wouldn't expect you to be able to, very frankly. Let me talk to you just briefly a little bit about kind of your general impressions of our criminal justice system. Do you think it works pretty well or how would you describe your thoughts about that?
- A. There's no doubt that it is somewhat slanted toward those who are able to afford better justice. But for all its flaws, it's still the best system in the world, I think.
- Q. Again, I don't know if you remember your answers you put down. At one point I think you said, I guess, one of the potential dangers in the system is that maybe some of the participants would get overly emotional

about it, I guess, I think the words you used. I don't know if you recall that, but I was curious what you were thinking when you put that down, overly emotional or overly involved in the case, maybe taking it too personally, I guess.

A. Yeah.

- Q. Is that a concern of yours or --
- A. I'm not sure.
- Q. Okay. Fair enough. Particularly with the death penalty, let me kind of run something by you and see what you think. We often give these fact situations or scenarios. You know, I think when a lot of people think about a capital punishment case, you know, in Texas capital punishment is just limited to a certain type of murder case. You kill someone during the commission of a robbery or kill a particular person like a police officer on duty, fireman, child under six. I think often people think of these crimes as committed by one person. In reality a lot of crimes are committed by more than one individual, groups or gangs of people.

And, you know, the law doesn't necessarily require that in order to be eligible for capital punishment, a capital murder conviction, and a death sentence, that you necessarily have to be the person that pulled the trigger, the person that caused the death. In certain circumstances the law allows us to prosecute people

and ask for the death penalty when those people did not pull the trigger. What do you think about that type of scenario?

- A. I would -- I agree with that, because if you are an accomplice, you share in the responsibility, even if you didn't actually pull the trigger. You didn't stop it, either.
- Q. Okay. So -- and we talk to quite a few people and we give them that example. You know, some people tell us, well, if you didn't actually pull the trigger or cause the death, then I'd just take the death penalty off the table for you. I would limit the death penalty just for the person that pulled the trigger.

And I take it you don't feel like that, that you could keep an open mind and maybe a death sentence for a nonshooter; is that right?

### A. Yeah.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Yes or no, she has to record everything that you say. It's perfectly normal, perfectly normal. You have not been in this situation before, but she can't record a head nod or uh-huh.

# PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Right.

Q. (By Mr. Wirskye) Mr. Peterson, that is, basically, what the law envisions. We call it sometimes the law of accomplices or in Texas we call it the law of parties, if someone is an accomplice or a party to an

offense.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Shook and I decide an offense.

Mr. Shook and I decide he's going to have the gun. He's

going to pull the gun on the teller and I'm going to come in

and just grab the money. And we get together and plan this.

And I know what a violent person he is and what a hair

temper he has.

And we go in there and rob that bank and for some reason he shoots and kills the teller, you know.

Then, obviously, he's committed capital murder and could be prosecuted for the death penalty. And under certain circumstances the law would, also, allow me, the nonshooter, to be prosecuted for the death penalty.

And I take it that you would agree with that depending on the facts and circumstances?

- A. Generally, yes.
- Q. Okay. Is there anything that you can think of off the top of your head that would be important when you are looking at someone like me, a nonshooter, when you are talking about getting a potential death penalty?
  - A. At this time I can't.
- Q. Okay. And the law, basically, is there's a couple of different ways to find me guilty of capital murder, the nonshooter, you know, if I help, encourage, or aid him, I can be found guilty. Or even if I didn't want

anybody to get killed, if I just signed up for a robbery, if I should have anticipated a life would be taken, then I can be held guilty. And I knew he went in with a loaded gun, I knew he had a bad temper, and he was the type of person that may shoot or kill someone for no reason. Obviously, under the Texas law I could be found guilty and potentially face the death penalty.

And that sounds like that's something that you generally agree with, right?

A. Yes.

Q. One thing in Texas, a lot of people are not aware of this when we ask a jury in a death penalty case whether to assess the death penalty or not, it's not just, you know, a thumbs up or thumbs down on the death penalty. The system we have, and I'll refer you to this chart, is if you find somebody guilty of capital murder, we ask the jury to answer these. They are called Special Issues. I just call them questions. We ask the jury to answer these questions and depending on how the jury answers these questions, that ultimately determines what sentence will be imposed on the defendant, whether it be a life sentence or whether they actually receive the death penalty. We'll talk about them a little bit more in depth in a little while.

But I'll run them through you real quick.

The first question, basically, asks whether the person is a

continuing threat to society or future danger to society. If the answer is yes to that, you move on to the second question. That kind of deals with the scenario we have just been talking about, whether the person was the triggerman or if he wasn't the triggerman, did he intend there be a death or did he anticipate there be a death. If the answer to that is yes, then you move on to the final question or Special Issue No. 3, which is kind of a safety valve, safety net type question. And that just asks the jury to see if there's anything mitigating that you have heard, the facts of the crime or the defendant's background, such that you think it's sufficient to spare his life and give him that life sentence, other than the death penalty.

That's kind of the scheme we have and that's what we ask jurors to do. You probably weren't aware of that before you walked in here?

A. No, I was not.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Is that something that you generally think that you could agree with, that type of thing?
  - A. Yes, I do.
- Q. Okay. Have any hesitations on that? You didn't sound like -- you might have a little hesitation?
- A. No, just things you definitely have to consider before imposing the death sentence.
  - Q. Okay. You would feel comfortable with that

scheme?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- A. Yes.
- Q. And we talk to quite a lot of people and there are a lot of people, maybe such as yourself, that have thought, intellectually at least, in favor of the death penalty or in the abstract in favor of the death penalty as a punishment, but when you get down here actually in a courtroom and you may be called on to get on that jury and you are sitting here looking at a living, breathing human being, the defendant who is on trial, it becomes quite another thing.
  - A. Yeah.
- Q. And, you know, I'll be honest with you.

  That's -- I'll put my cards on the table. I mean, we think that we have the nature and type of evidence that's going to cause a jury to find this man guilty of capital murder as a nontriggerman, as a party, or an accomplice. We, also, feel we're going to have the type of evidence that's going to cause the jury to answer those questions in such a way that ultimately one day the man down at the end of the table will be lying dead on a gurney down in Huntsville.

And I hate to put too fine a point on it, but that's what we're here about.

- A. Right.
- Q. And there are some people we talk to that are

not necessarily comfortable making those decisions or taking a pen in hand and answering those questions in such a way that may result in the death of another human being. And if you feel that way, that's fine. But we kind of need to know before we get you in the jury box.

Are you comfortable participating in that type of process?

- A. Not comfortable, but if it comes down to it, I would do my best.
- Q. Okay. If the facts and evidence showed you he was guilty of capital murder and the questions should be answered yes, yes, and no, would you be able to do that? Do your duty?
  - A. I would hope so.
  - Q. Okay.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- A. Until it comes down to it, it's hard to know.
- Q. Being a lawyer, we a lot of times talk in terms of yes or no. As the Judge said, we have to write it down. So when I hear an answer with any equivocation, I have to go in and explore it.

It's really -- it really boils down to this. This is our chance to talk to you, both sides.

Neither side wants to put anyone in an uncomfortable situation. And, you know, once you are over on the jury, it's too late --

- A. Right.
- Q. -- if something comes up and you are back in the jury room with the other jurors. So this is kind of our chance to talk about it. Probably comfortable is a bad word, but at least if you think that you are the type person that can participate in the process and hold the State to their burden and follow the law, a fair trial for Mr. Murphy, and depending on the facts and the law make whatever decision is appropriate, even if it results in the death penalty.

Do you think that you are the type person that can do that?

- A. I believe so.
- Q. Okay. Let me ask you to do this. On the last page, you may have already looked at that -- but I'll ask you to look at it again. On the back of the last page is the indictment in this case. Even if you have already looked at it, take a few minutes to look over it again.
  - A. [Prospective juror complies.]

MR. WIRSKYE: Your Honor, can we

approach?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: You may.

(Bench conference)

THE COURT: Mr. Peterson, I appreciate your time and service to the Court here today. The parties

have agreed to excuse you from jury service in this case, so you do not have to come back. And all I can do is thank you for your time. You are free to go. [Prospective juror out] THE COURT: Ready for Ms. Ervin. [Prospective juror in] THE COURT: Good afternoon, Ms. Ervin. How are you? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm fine. THE COURT: Doing okay? 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah. 11 THE COURT: A little bit nervous when you 12 are the focus of attention versus hiding in the Central Jury 13 Room with five hundred other people? 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah. 15 THE COURT: This is the only time that 16 the lawyers will ever have to talk to you individually about 17 their case and your jury service. And my job is to be sure 18 that you understand the law. 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay. 20 THE COURT: That's why I provided that 21 guide for you. Did you have an opportunity to read that and 22 23 go through it? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 24 25 THE COURT: Did it cause more questions

than answers? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah. I have a question about -- it's on page 4. I'm not going to assume, but what do you mean by the word "actor"? THE COURT: Actor? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah. THE COURT: It could be a codefendant. We use the word "party." Sometimes you hear on TV "accomplice." 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: All right. 11 THE COURT: You can substitute defendant, as well. You have someone who is not a defendant, but also 12 an actor in the crime. 13 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I wanted to know if I guessed it right. 15 16 THE COURT: Did you guess it right? 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 18 THE COURT: Good. We appreciate questions like that. Means you read it and are thinking 19 about it. The attorneys will go over in more detail how 20 that law all interacts together, but my job is to be sure 21 that at the end of this process you understand what it 22 means. 23 24 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.

25

THE COURT: If you don't understand the

questions, you don't understand the law, say, Judge, I don't understand. Try to explain it to me again and we'll do that. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No problem. THE COURT: My question to you at this point is will you be able to serve this Court for two weeks beginning November 10th? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Um, yes. THE COURT: Mr. Shook? 10 MR. SHOOK: May it please the Court. JILL ERVIN, 11 having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as 12 follows: 13 DIRECT EXAMINATION 14 BY MR. SHOOK: 15 Q. Ms. Ervin, my name is Toby Shook and I'm going 16 to ask you questions on behalf of the State. There aren't 17 any right or wrong answers to any of our questions. We just 18 want your honest opinions, all right? 19 20 A. Okay. 21 You have been pretty honest in your questionnaire. We appreciate you taking the time to fill 22 that out. Believe it or not that saves you time. 23

You have to be able to speak up close enough.

This is a little distracting.

Α.

Q.

24

You are close to her and your voice projects well. Anyway
I'm going to ask you some questions based on some
information that you put in here and also generally about
the laws and the death penalty and how you feel about it.

A. Okay.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. How long have you lived here in the Dallas area?
  - A. Been here for about 13 years.
  - Q. Where did you live prior to that?
  - A. Grand Prairie.
  - Q. So you have lived in the Metroplex?
- A. I've been in Dallas -- well, I've been in Texas, Dallas, first since 1972.
- Q. All right. Let me ask you, on the death penalty we asked -- you said that you are in favor of it as a law. And I don't know if you remember your answers, but I like to give you your answer and then let you follow up on it. Okay?
  - A. Okay, good.
- Q. Because we asked you to explain and you were pretty straightforward. You said if a person killed someone, he or she should have the same fate. Follow up on that. You are in favor of the death penalty as a law. What purpose do you think the death penalty serves?
  - A. Um, well, it's, I think for most people it's a

deterrent.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Most people, it's a deterrent?
- Q. You do that, I mean, it's not like you crashed into -- okay. It's not like you crashed into a car or made a mistake. This is --
  - Q. An intentional act?
  - A. Yeah. This is the word, that anyone can do.
- Q. Have you followed any cases in the media that you thought were worthy of the death penalty or locally or nationally?
  - A. No, no.
- Q. Okay. When you think of a capital murder case or a death penalty case, what types of cases do you think of?
- A. As a rule I don't generally watch the news. The last big case, I guess, that I followed or paid any attention to was the O. J. Simpson trial, so that's pretty much.
  - Q. What were your thoughts about that case?
- A. It was horrible. And I believed that he did it.
- Q. Okay. And in 1994 you wrote that your cousin, Ted, was shot to death by someone robbing a store. Was that here locally?
  - A. Yes, it was.

THE COURT: Did you say husband? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, it was my husband's cousin, Ted. He owned a pawnshop and --0. (By Mr. Shook) They came in and robbed? Α. They came in and robbed and they shot him and his business partner and they killed him. Q. Was he a former Dallas police officer? Α. I don't believe so. No, no, he wasn't. 0. Was his shop in the Pleasant Grove area? Α. 10 It was close to the VA Hospital. on the same -- Lancaster, it was on Lancaster Road. 11 12 Q. All right. I thought it was a different case. Α. 13 Sorry. Q. Was anyone arrested in that case? 14 Α. No. 15 ο. So it's still unsolved? 16 Α. Yes. 17 Q. That case, you said, it influenced you, the 18 way that you feel about the death penalty? 19 Well, it -- it wasn't -- it wasn't a case. 20 Ιf I put down case, I'm sorry. Nothing happened. 21 0. I mean that event? 22 Yes. It was he had three beautiful children 23 and my cousin, Leslie, and --24 25 Q. Pretty emotional event?

- A. Yeah.
- Q. In fact, it still brings a lot of emotion to you?
  - A. Sorry.
- Q. That's okay. We have that happen a number of times. Do you think that type of case, because you were close or obviously caused effects on his family, and then this is a similar type case, that that might affect you in your deliberations or possibly?
- A. I don't think so, because I don't know any of the particulars.
- Q. Sometimes we have cases, because you don't know what type of case you are going to be brought down on
  - A. Right.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. -- and, obviously, most people don't have this situation, fortunately. If this was a burglary case or DWI, you probably wouldn't have a problem at all. But since you have been close to a similar fact situation, sometimes it brings up the emotions and that's fine, you know. We can always have you on another panel.
  - A. Okay.
- Q. But you have a little emotion there and I understand that.
  - A. I'm sorry.

- Q. No. We've had that before and that's why we ask you that question.
  - A. Okay.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. And because you were close to that situation and saw the effects, I'm just wondering if that might be a factor or possibly could come up during, you know, the -- obviously, you start hearing similar facts in this type of thing.
- A. I don't think that I would get emotional.

  Because I don't -- okay. I don't know any of these

  particulars and I haven't -- and I don't even know who this

  person is. Apparently it's fairly recent. But in 2000 I

  was going through a divorce, so I wasn't paying attention to

  anything that was going on in the news.
  - Q. All right.

MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, I think that we have come to an agreement.

MS. BUSBEE: Yes.

THE COURT: Ms. Ervin, we appreciate your honesty and willingness to serve, even on this type of case. But the lawyers think it may be just a little too close for this type of case and have agreed to excuse you from jury service.

I want to thank you for your time and coming back down here and having to relive that memory, but

you won't have to serve any further on this case. So you are free to go. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you. THE COURT: Thank you. [Prospective juror out] [End of Volume] 

STATE OF TEXAS

COUNTY OF DALLAS

I, NANCY BREWER, Official Court Reporter for the 283rd Judicial District Court, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing constitutes a true and correct transcription of all portions of evidence and other proceedings requested in writing by counsel for the parties to be included in this volume of the Reporter's Record, in the above-styled and numbered cause, all of which occurred in open court or in chambers and were reported by me.

WITNESS MY OFFICIAL HAND on this the day of 2004.

NANCY BREWER, CSR, NO. 5759
Expiration Date: 12-31-04
Official Reporter, 283rd JDC
Frank Crowley Crts. Bldg. LB33
133 No. Industrial Blvd.
Dallas, TX 75207
(214)653-5863

REPORTER'S RECORD

VOLUME 8 OF 6 VOLUMES

74851

TRIAL COURT CAUSE NO. F01-00328-T

STATE OF TEXAS \* IN THE DISTRICT COURT

VS. \* DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS

PATRICK HENRY MURPHY, JR. \* 283RD DISTRICT COURT

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

INDIVIDUAL VOIR DIRE

COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

MAR 9 - 2004

Troy C. Bennett, Jr., Clerk

On the 29th day of August 2003, the following proceedings came on to be heard in the above-entitled and numbered cause before the Honorable Vickers L. Cunningham, Sr., Judge Presiding, held in Dallas, Dallas County, Texas.

Proceedings reported by machine shorthand.

**ORIGINAL** 

24 25

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

## APPEARANCES

## APPEARING FOR THE STATE

Mr. Toby Shook SBOT NO. 18293250

And /

Mr. Bill Wirskye SBOT NO. 00788696

Assistant District Attorneys

133 No. Industrial Blvd.

Dallas, Texas 75207

Phone: 214/653-3600

## APPEARING FOR THE DEFENDANT

Ms. Brook Busbee Attorney at Law

SBOT: 03488000

703 McKinney Ave. Ste. 312

Dallas, TX 75202

214/754-9090

Mr. Juan Sanchez

Attorney at Law SBOT: 00791599

5630 Yale Blvd.

Dallas, TX 75206

214/365-0700

16

10

12

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

		•		
	PROSPECTIVE	JUROR INDEX		
PROSPECTIVE JUROR	CRT.	STATE	DEFENSE	<u>VOL</u> .
Georgia Portillo	4	5		8
Mary Sullivan	25	27	•	8
Jamie Garber	34	35	65	. 8
Brad Richards	74	75	101	8
Glenn Hamman	117	119	151	8

## PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: Ms. Portillo.

[Prospective juror in]

THE COURT: Good morning.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning.

THE COURT: How are you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.

THE COURT: And your name is Georgina

Portillo?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Thank you for being here on time. You were the second one we were going to talk to this morning, but since you were here first and early and read that, we got you in and probably saved you about an hour and a half. Sound good?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah.

THE COURT: You recall being here back in May and filling out that short questionnaire for us?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Short?

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am. You recall that you were under oath and sworn in and as you read you are still under oath today.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: The main thing that the lawyers ask is just tell the truth, give your honest

opinions, don't think he's going that way, she's going that way. Just say what is on your mind. There are no wrong answers.

My job is to be sure that you understand the law and you have read very quickly this morning that the law in this case can get somewhat complicated. That's why the lawyers are going to spend some time with you this morning, go over the law, and if you don't understand it, say I don't understand your question or would you rephrase that and, as I said, the objective is for you to be able to understand the law. And they will ask you, can you follow the law? Fair enough?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.

THE COURT: The only question that I have for you, myself, is this trial is scheduled to begin on November 10th. Will you be able to give the Court two weeks of your time?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Very good. Mr. Shook?

#### GEORGINA PORTILLO,

having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

#### **DIRECT EXAMINATION**

#### BY MR. SHOOK:

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Ms. Portillo, my name is Toby Shook. I'm

going to ask you questions on behalf of the State. You have been on a jury before so you kind of know how this works a little bit. Although normally we select a jury from a large panel, which I'm sure was done in your last case that you served on, but -- and the questions were asked of the panel as a whole and few individual questions.

But because it's a capital murder case where the State is seeking the death penalty, we have this process where we talk to each juror individually. I know that can be a little intimidating, at least make you feel like you are on trial. Most people come in feeling that way. But we try to make you as relaxed as possible and you can ask us questions anytime. We'll ask you a whole lot of questions.

I'll go over some things in your questionnaire. I'm going to ask you how you honestly feel about the death penalty, capital murder, some of the laws that apply to this case. All right?

A. Okay.

- Q. You were born and raised here in Dallas?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And have worked here all your life. Let me -let me ask you this. The Judge told you the trial should
  last two weeks at the most and you indicated to him you
  didn't think -- obviously, it would be an inconvenience, but

that wouldn't be a problem for you, if you were called to sit down here for two weeks; is that right?

- A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. Let's talk, since you have had experience in a trial, you put on your questionnaire that it was a murder case and the defendant was sentenced to 80 years?
  - A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. How long ago was that?
- A. Um, maybe a year and a half to two years ago.
- Q. Okay. What -- tell us a little bit about what you remember about the case, what type of facts, or what did it involve?
- A. Well, it involved drugs. Apparently somebody knew somebody took them to another person's house. That person came back alone without the mutual friend and I guess he wanted to take his drugs or something like that and people shot at each other and the guy that lived at the apartment ended up dead.
  - Q. Ended up dead?
  - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. So it was people involved in a drug transaction?
  - A. Something like that, yeah.
  - Q. And they started shooting and one died?

- A. Uh-huh.
- Q. Okay. How long did the trial last? Do you remember?
- A. Maybe two days and then we had -- were sequestered one night or something like that, not too long.
  - Q. So it wasn't a long process?
  - A. No, not too long.
  - Q. Did the defendant testify at trial?
  - A. No, I don't think so, but I'm not sure.
- Q. Was a previous criminal record put on in the punishment stage? Do you remember?
  - A. No, I don't think -- and I don't remember.
- Q. But primarily the punishment that was given was just over the fact that a life was taken and the way it was taken, the facts of the offense?
  - A. Correct.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. How did the deliberations go? Were they pretty smooth? Or sometimes jurors tell us they were in pretty much agreement and others tell us there were horrible arguments back there.
- A. No, it went pretty smooth. I think where we had the problem was determining the actual penalty, the actual time, or what have you.
- Q. And you came up with 80 years. How was that arrived at?

- A. Well, I mean, personally mine was -- I believe in the death penalty and everything, but to be one to actually say, to make that decision, it's kind of hard and I think a lot of us felt that way, so we took apparently the next best step we thought was to make it a permanent time there.
- Q. Eighty years, was this case being tried for the death penalty or was just the --
  - A. I think it may have been. I'm not sure.
- Q. Well, that's the next area I want to get into is how you feel about the death penalty. You told us that you believe in it as a law?
  - A. Yeah.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

. 22

23

24

- Q. And you believe in the saying an eye for an eye?
  - A. Right.
- Q. Is that something that you were growing up or taught as a child and you grew in maturity and believed in the death penalty?
  - A. Yes. Basically out of my religion-type thing.
- Q. What purpose do you think the death penalty serves?
  - A. Um --
- Q. As a law, as a goal for punishment, just punishment for punishment's sake, or to deter other people

from committing the crimes or --

- A. Um, I guess I do believe that it does take that person out of society, if they have done something horribly wrong.
- Q. Have you followed any cases or there's some types of cases that you believe the death penalty should be used for anything that you have seen in the news or your personal beliefs?
- A. I don't really follow too much on them. I do believe where children are affected or killed and things like that or even police officers. I do believe that they are there to protect and serve as a community, so we should provide their protection.
- Q. So you believe the murder of a police officer is one of the types of crimes that the death penalty should be considered?
  - A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Okay. Let me ask you this, while I'm thinking about it. This case received a lot of publicity when it occurred and almost every juror has mentioned that they saw something on TV and radio. That's natural. So we want to talk to every juror about what they remember about the case.

What do you remember reading or seeing on TV when it occurred?

A. Um, not very much to tell you the truth. I

remember that -- I mean, I know the particular area that it occurred at, that there were several, about four or five, I guess, guys that were involved in that when they finally caught them, I think, and that's really about it.

- Q. Okay. Did you ever follow any of the trials after they were caught?
  - A. No.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Do you think that would influence you in any way what you read or heard about the trial?
  - A. No, I don't know very much of it.
- Q. That's -- the law is, if you read something, you have to be able to put that away and just determine the case based on the evidence. And you wouldn't have a problem doing that?
  - A. No.
- Q. Let's talk about, a little more about the death penalty. The death penalty in Texas is reserved for certain intentional murders, not every intentional murder. You can have some bad killings and they couldn't get the death penalty, but intentional killings that occur with some aggravated facts. And you mentioned a few. Murders that occur during the course of felonies such as robbery, murdering someone while robbing a 7-Eleven store, killing the clerk, that could be a death penalty case. Murder or kidnapping or burglary, someone breaking into a house and

they killed the homeowner, during a rape, during an arson.

Also, murder of a specific victim like a police officer on duty, fireman on duty, or prison guard, child under the age of six, would be a death penalty case, or murder of more than one person in the same transaction or series of transactions, mass murder, that sort of thing, or a hitman situation, someone kills someone for money or profit.

But those are the specific types of situations that is reserved for the death penalty, at least consideration of the death penalty in Texas. That list I've gone over, do you agree that those types of crimes are the types that could be appropriate for the death penalty?

A. Yes, I do.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. If it were up to you, would you expand it and include other types of murders or other types of crimes?
  - A. Um, I don't know, possibly.
  - Q. Possibly?
  - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. Now, let's get down to another area. A lot of people tell us they believe in the death penalty. Some people told us they are against it, for religious reasons, moral objections. Not everyone that's for the death penalty is comfortable or can sit in that type case.

We want to put all our cards on the table.

The way a death penalty case operates, you have the guilt/innocence stage where we have to prove the defendant's guilt. And then if we do that, we move to the punishment phase. And in the punishment phase, you hear additional evidence. Then you make your decisions, looking at what happened in the crime and any new evidence that you heard about their background and then you get these questions. And I'll go over the questions in a little more detail in a little while.

But, basically, the questions ask is the defendant a continuing danger to society? Did he cause the death or anticipate that a death would occur? And is there any mitigating evidence that a life sentence should be imposed rather than a death sentence? The jury does not write death or life in, but they answer these questions.

and no to the mitigating question, the Judge would have no choice. He would sentence the defendant to death. If they are answered any other way, he would get a life sentence. But those are the only two choices, once he's been found guilty of capital murder, a death sentence or life sentence, and that's determined by how the jury answers those questions.

Are you familiar with the method of execution in Texas?

A. No, not really.

Q. The procedures are the same. And they're covered sometimes on one of those high profile cases, that sort of thing. But the procedures are the same. They would be the same in this case. If Mr. Murphy was found guilty and these questions are answered yes, yes, and no, he would be sentenced to death by the Judge and he would be placed on death row. He would wait in a cell. I can't tell you how long, but at some point in time Judge Cunningham would then issue a date of execution.

Just prior to that date, the day before, he would be moved from death row to downtown Huntsville where there is a prison unit. On the date of his execution he would be given an opportunity to meet with his family, friends, a minister. He would be given an opportunity for a last meal.

But at 6:00 p.m. by law the executions take place. He would be taken to the execution chamber. He would be placed on a gurney, because the method of execution is by lethal injection. He would be secured by leather straps. There are witnesses that are brought in. Witnesses that represent him, also witnesses for the victim.

The warden goes into the room. After he's secured, there's needles placed in his arm. He's then given an opportunity to make a last statement. Sometimes

these are read in the paper the next day, asking for forgiveness or expressing his innocence. But after that statement is made, the warden signals the executioner and poisons are injected into his body. It's poisons that act very quickly while he is conscious. His lungs will collapse. His lungs will force the air out. His heart will be stopped and he will pass out into a coma within about ten seconds.

And I don't detail that to be morbid, but I do want to lay our cards out on the table because it's one thing for us to talk about it philosophically, I believe in the death penalty, it's right for some cases. And it's another one when you get down here and you realize, I could be placed on the jury and asked to make a decision that's going to end someone's life some day. And I could be reading about that and I would be responsible for that.

And I just want every juror to realize that because it is our goal in this case that we feel we have the type and quality of evidence that will convince a jury to convict the defendant of this crime and to answer those questions in a way that he would be executed some day -- you probably know from reading in the papers that Texas leads the nation in executions. Some states have it and they never enforce it. You know in Texas that punishment will be ultimately carried out and if these questions are

answered the way we think they will, Mr. Murphy will be executed some day.

Some people can't sit on juries like this and make these decisions and other people just say, I can't do it for whatever reason and that's perfectly fine. We have no objection to that. You just have to be able to tell us that's the way you feel. If you can do it, that's fine, too.

But you talked a little bit -- I want to make sure about this. When you said, you know, I believe in the death penalty. I always have. I just don't know if I'm the one that could make that decision. And that's what I want to ask you about is to be as honest as you can with us, if you were placed on a jury like this, would you be able to take pen in hand and write in these answers, if the State proves it to you, knowing that when you do that, this man would be executed some day?

- A. I can answer the questions, yes.
- Q. And you feel you can take that responsibility and do that?
  - A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. When you said earlier about some hesitation, what was going through your mind then?
- A. Well, it was just -- I mean, it is another person's life. Whatever he's done, he's done. But, I mean,

in answering the questions, I could do that.

Q. You feel you could?

- A. Yeah, I believe I could.
- Q. Let me get into another area. When we talk about capital murder we usually think about the triggerman, the person that actually causes the death. In any type of crime you don't always have just one person committing the crime. Sometimes you have groups of people that commit crimes.

The law says that if you all actively participate in carrying out a crime, you could all be responsible, even though one might have a greater role than another. Sometimes it takes more than one person to commit a crime. And the same is true with capital murder. You can have groups of people commit capital murder.

An example would be Mr. Wirskye and I, let's say we want to rob a bank. We go in there. I have the guns, but Mr. Wirskye, he's not armed. He knows I have guns. He's got a bag. We have another man that's outside as our getaway driver. We're all planning this out together. He waits outside and has the car running. He's going to shout at us if the police come.

I go in and I pull guns and I threaten everyone and Mr. Wirskye starts gathering up the money.

Something goes wrong. Maybe one of the tellers does

something I don't like. Maybe one goes for an alarm.

Mr. Wirskye says that one is trying to get away. Anyway, I shoot them. He didn't do it, the driver doesn't do it, I shoot them. We all run out. We're captured soon after that.

Obviously, I can be prosecuted for capital murder. I can receive the death penalty because I'm the triggerman. The law says that the other men involved, Mr. Wirskye and the driver, can, also, be prosecuted for capital murder and could even, depending on the facts, be sentenced to death because they are just as responsible under the law, if they are actively participating in this crime.

Some people disagree with that part of the law when it comes to the death penalty. If it were up to them, they would draw the line for someone deserving the death penalty, as just -- they reserve it just for the triggerman, the person who causes the death. They might have another very severe punishment, life sentence, 99 years, for the persons that helped them, the accomplices, but they would not reserve the death penalty for them.

Other people feel the other way. They think those people should ultimately be given the death penalty.

How do you feel about that law as far as the accomplices go? I know you are fine with the

triggerman, but in situations where there are other people
that help, how do you feel about that?

A. Um, well, I mean, is it just specifically you
were the only one with the gun?

Q. I'm sorry, what?

A. Are you saying that -- I mean, I guess, in
other words, say from the news we know that you are the only

- one that had the gun. Are you asking me -- I mean, are you asking me just because you have the gun, you shot, are the other ones as equally as guilty?
- Q. Yes. What I'm asking, do you have a problem with the accomplices who don't have the gun being prosecuted for capital murder --
  - A. Oh, no.
  - Q. -- and the death penalty?
  - A. No.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. Even if they didn't do any shooting?
- A. No.
- Q. You think that's fair?
- A. I do.
- Q. Why is that? Why do you --
- A. Well, I mean, you go in with the idea of robbing the bank. Whatever end results, whether it was planned or just you got nervous or whatever, he informed you that person was reaching for the alarm, so what's the

difference? He's signaling you for whatever action you took.

- Q. So you feel he's just as responsible?
- A. Uh-huh, yes.
- Q. That's what the law envisions. But I want to make sure you are on board with that, because it is our theory and we will prosecute this case under what we call the law of parties. We will prosecute Mr. Murphy as an accomplice in that he's not the triggerman, but a party and accomplice to the offense. You have no problem with that?
  - A. No.

Q. Okay. The way the law says is we can prove it in two ways, either you are actively participating, encouraging, aiding the offense to occur, and we'll probably, usually you prove both methods, but you only have to prove one. Or the law also says if we enter into a conspiracy, say Mr. Wirskye and I -- and a conspiracy is merely just an agreement. We decide we want to rob the bank. And if we're committing that, robbing the bank, and one of us commits another offense, and in this case murder, and in order to further that robbery, then we are all held responsible, if we should have anticipated that something like that should happen.

And I think that you kind of explained that when you said, hey, you knew that guy had a gun.

- A. Uh-huh.
- Q. You know, you warned them that someone was going for an alarm, so you should have known what was going to happen. You can use that loaded weapon and kill someone.
  - A. Uh-huh.
  - Q. Just a common sense principle.
  - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. Maybe the theory would be different, if you didn't know he had a gun. And the example that I gave, everyone knew he was armed and that sort of thing. And then that's how we have to go about proving this case and you have no problem with that? You agree with the law?
  - A. No.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Let's talk a little bit about these Special Issues. I want to go over them kind of one at a time. So if you would take a moment to read Special Issue No. 1 to yourself.
  - A. [Prospective juror complies.]
- Q. Okay. Question No. 1, it asks kind of for you to make a prediction. Starts out with a no answer under the law and we have to prove from the facts of the crime itself and any other evidence that you hear, that it should be answered yes.
- Now, you don't get to this question until you have found the defendant guilty of capital murder. And

it asks whether there's a probability that the defendant would commit criminal acts of violence that would constitute a continuing threat. You see how that question is asking you to make a prediction about how they are going to act in the future?

Let me ask you, first, do you feel you could answer that question if you are given sufficient facts?

A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Okay. What would be important to you in answering that question?
- A. Well, um, I guess it's previous -- not previous, but if you had been in trouble before, I guess.
  - Q. Okay.
- A. If we get to find that out or, um, I guess just his behavior.
- Q. Okay. If he has a criminal record and been in trouble before, that type of evidence is admissible in that stage of the trial. It can go into that consideration and, obviously, the crime itself, committing the murder, is something that you can consider.

Do you feel that you could get enough information from the facts of the crime itself to enable you to answer that question yes? Their role in the crime, how it happened?

A. I believe so.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Okay. Now, let me ask you this because people feel differently and I want to get your honest opinion on this when you get to this question. You would have just found the defendant guilty of capital murder, that is, you believe he committed beyond a reasonable doubt. Some people tell us, if I have reached that decision where he is guilty of capital murder beyond a reasonable doubt and this is the future danger question, they are going to be a danger. That tells me enough at that point in time that he's going to be dangerous. He's committed capital murder. Other people tell us, no, that doesn't answer the question. And, as I said, people feel differently about that.

How do you feel about that situation based on that question No. 1, the future danger question, once you found him guilty of capital murder?

- A. What is the question? I'm sorry.
- Q. Do you feel that that finding alone, he's guilty of capital murder beyond a reasonable doubt, do you think that answers yes to No. 1 for you that he is a continuing danger to society?
  - A. Yeah, I think so.
  - Q. And why is that?
- A. Well, I mean, if he killed for whatever reason, robbing a place, I guess, I mean, what makes us not

believe that if he gets a chance again that it wouldn't go the same way?

- Q. Okay. Let me ask you how you feel about some of the language in question No. 1. We have to prove that there's a probability that the defendant would commit criminal acts of violence in the future. What does "probability" mean to you in that sense?
  - A. Just a possibility, the slightest chance.
- Q. Slightest chance, okay. How about "criminal acts of violence"? What does that mean to you?
- A. That would be a robbery, a threat towards family -- anybody, I guess, kids and adults.
- Q. A threat to another human? And how about "society"? What does that mean to you?
  - A. Just means me, my community.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Okay. Question No. 2, will you take a moment to read that to yourself? That one is a little bit longer and is a little more complicated.

MR. SHOOK: Judge, may we approach?

THE COURT: You may.

(Bench conference)

THE COURT: Ms. Portillo, the parties have agreed we're not going to have you on this jury, but I want to thank you for your time and your service to this Court and this county and how much more you have learned

going through this process. But this is not the case that you will be seated on.

So you got in early and you saved about an hour and a half and you are out the door before 9:00. Not too bad. We appreciate your time and you are free to go. Thank you.

[Prospective juror out]

THE COURT: Has Sullivan arrived?

[Prospective juror in]

THE COURT: Good morning.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning.

THE COURT: How are you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm fine.

THE COURT: And your name is Mary

Elizabeth Sullivan?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Good morning. I want to thank you for being here. I see you brought your reading material. We didn't have you wait too long. Did you have an opportunity to review the guide that I provided for you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: And the witness list?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Um, no, sir.

THE COURT: Didn't get a witness list?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: There was one in

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

there, but they just told us this. They didn't say anything about the witness list.

THE COURT: All right. My job today is to be sure that you understand the law, as you have read, hopefully, a couple of times. The law can be somewhat complicated and can be overwhelming. So our job here is to be sure that you understand the law and the attorneys will ask you questions about that. If you don't understand the question or if you do not understand how the law works, just please tell us.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.

THE COURT: The question that I have for you is this trial shall begin on November 10th. Will you be able to give the Court two weeks of your time?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Um, it would be hard because of my job.

 $\label{eq:THE_COURT:} \mbox{I read that Medicare,}$  Medicaid billing.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: For a nursing home.

THE COURT: And it would be an imposition on your job, but they will just have to deal with that.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: I mean, we can't give business reasons, trust me. If, as I said to the general panel, if I let everybody off that had a business excuse, we

wouldn't be able to have any jurors down here. So I understand it may be a hardship for your employer, but that's just the way it goes. Sometimes they will have to understand.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.

THE COURT: So with that, Mr. Wirskye,

you may inquire.

### MARY SULLIVAN,

having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

#### DIRECT EXAMINATION

# BY MR. WIRSKYE:

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. How are you this morning, ma'am?
- A. I'm fine.
- Q. My name is Bill Wirskye and I'll be the assistant DA that's going to visit with you a little bit this morning, talk a little bit about some of the information in your questionnaire.
  - A. Okay.
- Q. Talk a little bit about how you feel, your thoughts and feelings on the death penalty, and then talk to you maybe about some of the law that may apply here, if you are selected as juror in this case.

I know you told the Judge it would be a hardship for your work?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Would you kind of tell us a little more detail?
- A. I do the billing for six nursing homes that we own. I'm the only one right now that can do the Medicare billing, so it would be a delay in funds for our nursing homes.
- Q. Okay. Would it interrupt the cash flow, is what you put in the questionnaire maybe?
  - A. Yes.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Would that be a major disruption for your -- I guess what I'm --
- A. It would if we could -- I mean, there would have to be a way that we would have to plan ahead to do it.
- Q. Do you think that given enough notice you could make some arrangements?
  - A. Probably, yes.
- Q. Okay. How long -- what company is that that you work with?
- A. It's called Paramount Healthcare. I work at the corporate office.
  - Q. How long have you worked there?
  - A. For -- since 1996.
- Q. Okay. Before we get into all the serious stuff, you said that your favorite show is "Trading Spaces"?

- A. Yes. I'm not, you know, just --
- Q. That's what my wife and I do every weekend is "Trading Spaces" or "While You Were Out". So who is your favorite designer?
  - A. Vern.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Okay. Do you like Genevieve?
- A. Not really.
- Q. Me neither, not a big fan of hers. One thing that we ask in the questionnaire and it's a little unfair we talk about it, you filled it out in May and you have not seen it and we all have copies of it, but when you are talking about asking -- I guess, the first thing that popped into your mind about prosecutors you said "Well, normally stay within the law to convict". And I was just wondering what that means or coming from TV or --
- A. It is really because watching -- they have had shows recently where they show one of the like the "Law and Order" shows and sometimes you just wonder what they're thinking when they're doing things and --
- Q. Not having been a prosecutor for a while the things that they do on "Law and Order" surprise me.
- A. They have the real one, "Criminal Intent" where they have actual cases.
- Q. What do you think about that series? I watched it a little bit.

- A. Um, sometimes I didn't think they did enough research on their job or asked enough questions or sometimes I thought they had evidence staring them in the face that they didn't use. But that might be because it's a TV show and we didn't see everything.
  - Q. The way it's edited?
  - A. Uh-huh.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Okay. If you are selected to serve as juror in this case, are you going to have that in the back of your mind as you watch us try our case?
- A. I would hope not. We're not supposed to do that. So I would hope that I could come with the right frame of mind for what it is.
  - Q. Uh-huh.
- A. But I do, to be honest, I do tend to be conservative, so that's going to play a part, I'm sure.
- Q. A lot of times we ask jurors to come down here and not think or not consider about things they know to be facts. And in a sense that's a little bit unfair. But let me ask you this. You, like almost everybody we talked to, has mentioned that they have heard some of the publicity about this case.
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Can you tell us what you have heard or what you remember about this case?

- A. Um, I would say about the defendant, nothing personal. I know absolutely nothing about this person. I don't know even what he was in jail for previously when he escaped. Just -- I haven't read up on it or anything to that extent. What I've heard has been on the radio or on the TV news.
- Q. Okay. Do you remember any details you may have heard?

- A. Um, to be honest, just what the account of what the crime was and what, you know, what happened and I don't even know that that's fact, to be honest. I mean, just about the shooting that, you know, they rolled over the police officer, supposedly. I don't know that to be fact, though. That's just how it was reported.
- Q. Knowing those details or having heard that, how do you think it may affect you if you actually get over in the jury box and become one of the jurors in this case?
- A. I think that, unfortunately, knowing that if it was true that it would really bother me in the sense that it just couldn't be a robbery, that they had to roll over the policeman with the car. That would bother me. I mean, that display, I guess, a part is on my mind right now.
- Q. Okay. And we talk to a lot of people and people have heard differing information and formed different opinions one way or another about this case. And you know

yourself more than anyone what is in your heart of hearts.

You know, do you think it might affect your ability to

listen to the case or kind of --

- A. No. I think that I could be openminded. I mean, I don't -- don't -- it's not that I can't be swayed one way or the other. I would like to be able to think that I could hear facts and make a determination that way.
- Q. Okay. I know -- I guess we all like to think that, but --
  - A. Right.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. I guess what both sides are worried about, what we have already spoken about, you have heard something about this case and you are watching the trial and all, you don't hear about it and why isn't the prosecutor doing this or --
  - A. Right.
- Q. You have the same thing with the defense lawyers. I mean --
  - A. That wasn't favorable at all, I know.
- Q. Yeah. But like I said, I know sometimes it's unnatural to ask people to do that. I just want to make sure that you would be able to complete -- able to completely clear your mind and just focus on what you hear in the courtroom?
  - A. I don't honestly know that I could completely

put it out of my mind, no.

- Q. So you think maybe what you heard, read, seen, may possibly affect your verdict, something outside the courtroom? And that's okay if it does. Like I said, we talk to a lot of people. We just really need to know in your heart of hearts --
- A. I think with what -- I think my mind focuses more on the other -- the other verdicts of the other defendants, knowing that they have all been tried and convicted and all have gotten the same penalty. I think that would play more on my mind than the brutality of the crime, to be honest.

# Q. Okay.

appreciate your honesty and you may have made a comment that maybe I shouldn't have said that, but that's exactly what they need to hear. You are being honest. It may cause a problem and you want to be fair and a lot of people aren't as honest with themselves as you are. This case is just not the right one for you. The parties have agreed to excuse you.

Thank you for coming down and now you don't have to worry about your billing problems, but you can tell your employer, the Judge would have made me do it anyway. But you don't have to serve on this case, so you

are free to go. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you. [Prospective juror out] THE COURT: Ms. Garber. [Prospective juror in] THE COURT: Good morning. How are you? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good. How are you? THE COURT: Your name is Jamie R. Garber? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Garber. 10 THE COURT: Ms. Garber, thank you for being here this morning. Have you had enough time to review 11 the guide we provided for you? 12 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 14 THE COURT: And did you look at the witness list? 15 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. I glanced over that. 17 18 THE COURT: That's a lot of law to put on someone at 8:30 in the morning. 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It's all right. 20 21 THE COURT: And we don't expect you to be able to memorize that. The objective of the Court is for 22 you to be able to understand the law. Once you understand 23 the law, can you follow the law? That's the main -- my main 24 purpose here. If you don't understand the questions or 25

concept that's being discussed by the attorneys, just say, would you rephrase that or I don't understand. You know, this is the only time that you really get to interact with the lawyers and the Court.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.

THE COURT: Sometimes looks like you are the one on trial. We're certainly not trying to intimidate you by any means. It's just the only way that we can really have an opportunity to visit with you.

The question I have for you is, I've given you the trial date of November 10th. I need you for two weeks. Would you have any problem serving the Court with that time period?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir.

THE COURT: Mr. Shook?

## JAMIE GARBER,

having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

#### **DIRECT EXAMINATION**

## BY MR. SHOOK:

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Ms. Garber, my name is Toby Shook. I'll be asking you questions on behalf of the State this morning. You have been down on jury duty before?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. I was just looking at your questionnaire and I

couldn't tell if you actually served on a jury.

- A. I was on one in Coppell.
- Q. Okay. One of the city courts?
- A. Yes, yes.
- Q. Did it have something to do with parks, park rules?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Normally juror selection, you probably know this -- how many times have you been called down?
  - A. Three.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Okay. So we get you a lot, I guess. Normally we talk to the jurors in a big panel and then maybe have a few individual questions. But because it's a capital murder case where we're seeking the death penalty, the law requires us to do it individually. It's kind of a job interview situation almost. But you look pretty comfortable up there. The rules are, if you have any questions you want to ask of us, feel free to at any time. All we want to know are your honest opinions on these things. Okay?
  - A. Okay.
- Q. We can't go into the specific facts of this case. But, obviously, we may go into hypotheticals, ask you how you feel about other cases, that sort of thing. I'm going to talk about some of the information given us in the questionnaire and, also, how you feel about capital murder,

the laws that might apply. All right? Okay. Α. I see from your questionnaire you work at the -- how do I pronounce that? Α. It's the Insco Dico Group. I kept looking at dico and thinking disco. Ο. Most people do. Α. Q. What do you do with them? Α. We are a security bond company. Okay. And you have been with them how long? 0. 10 A. A year. 11 Q. All right. 12 As of July 29th. Α. 13 Q. Have you been in that type of business for 14 some time? 15 Α. Yes. About, um, six years, I believe, six or 16 seven years. I was in commercial insurance before that. 17 0. I also saw that you -- and this 18 Okay. questionnaire covers a little bit of everything. Believe it 19 or not, it is quite helpful to us. Some of the questions 20 21 might sound ridiculous, but your favorite radio station is 1310, "The Ticket"? 22 Α. Yes. 23 What show do you like the best? Q. 24 Α. I like "The Musers" and "The Hardline" in the 25

afternoon.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. I enjoy that, too.
- Q. The jury you sat on in Coppell, that was just someone violating the park rules?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. Like a --
- A. They were playing on the field without authorization.
- Q. Was that -- that case didn't take you a real long time?
  - A. No.
- Q. Let me ask you, then, a few questions from the questionnaire. We asked a whole lot of questions about the capital murder, obviously, and specifically this case and what you have heard about it and how, generally, you feel about a capital murder. You know that the State is seeking the death penalty, so we, obviously, want to talk to you about how you feel about the death penalty.

You put in your questionnaire that you favor it as a law and what I want you to do is kind of in your own words tell us why you favor it as a law or the objective that you feel the death penalty has as a punishment?

A. Well, I believe that depending on what type of crime was committed, that the death penalty should be asked

for. I'm a little nervous up here, so please forgive me. I have not been -- considering this crime and what happened, I believe that the death penalty should be given.

- Q. Okay. When you say "this crime" you mean --
- A. The one that you're -- I'm here for.
- Q. We ask because this is a high publicity crime in which people followed it a lot when it first occurred and you are no exception. You, obviously, followed it in the news, the newspapers. The law is this, just because you have seen something or read something, doesn't necessarily disqualify you as a juror. However, some jurors have seen more than others and followed the cases more closely than others.

What do you recall about the case when you followed it?

- A. That it happened at Oshman's. Just describe what I have read about it?
  - Q. Just what you remember.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A. That apparently the people were in Oshman's, acting kind of strangely, and they were there to rob the place. And apparently -- I can't remember if they took guns from Oshman's or if they already had them with them, but, of course, they were -- the intent was to get away with goods and by whatever means possible to try to escape, if they were caught.

And the police officer showed up and I don't know if he was in the back of the building or in the front of the building when all this happened, but he was shot. And I don't know if this is correct, but he was run over, also.

- Q. Did you follow the crime after it occurred, involving the capture and that sort of thing?
- A. Yeah. Apparently, they were caught in Colorado in a trailer park area.
- Q. Okay. How about any subsequent court proceedings with any of the individuals? Did you follow any
  - A. Not too closely, no, I did not.
- Q. Here's what the law is. Obviously, we can't ask you to forget everything you have heard. That would be impossible and defies common sense. The law recognizes that it's one thing to read things in newspapers and it's another thing sitting on a jury and deciding these facts.
  - A. Right.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Obviously, the jury has to decide and base their decisions just on what they hear in the courtroom and not on what they have seen on TV or newspapers because your better information is, common sense, it's going to come from the actual witnesses.
  - A. Right.

Q. Because the newspapers and TVs often get things wrong. In fact, they always get things wrong. That's why we try cases here in the courtroom with witnesses.

What the Judge instructs the jurors is you have to decide this case based on what you hear in the courtroom from the witnesses and cannot let what you have read or heard influence you in your decisions. And some people can do that, you know, they recognize that this information isn't the best. Maybe they didn't follow it closely and they cannot forget about it, but they would make their decision and require the State to prove their case just based on the witnesses.

2:1

And we just want your honest answer on that. You have read a lot. You followed the cases pretty closely, at least when it happened. Would you be able to follow that particular part of the law or from what you have already read and heard, would that, you think, influence you in your decision?

- A. I think I would try my best. But just -- I don't know. I get emotional because of what happened. I would try to do that (juror crying).
- Q. And I appreciate your honesty because, obviously, it got a lot of attention. And you, like a lot of people, were real interested in the crime. And that's

all I want is your honest opinion. Some people can follow that instruction and that's fine. And other people tell us I'm a little too close to this case and it's going to influence me from -- I've already formed an opinion as to guilt and punishment and that might stay there.

Other people tell us, no, I mean, I remember seeing a brutal crime, but I'm going to wait and make my decision on what I see in the courtroom. But there's no right or wrong answers. I just want your honest opinion. I know the defense wants to know this just as much as I do. And the Court, obviously, makes this decision.

- A. Well, I would do my best to go away from what I've read. But with any crime that's like this for murder, it's kind of hard to, I would think.
- Q. Do you think even if you tried your best, there might be --
- A. I don't know. I can't -- I don't know. I think I would. I think I would try to keep from reading, you know, keep from what I read in the newspapers and just base my opinion on what the defense and the prosecutors have told me.

MR. SHOOK: Judge, can I approach just one moment?

THE COURT: You may.

(Bench conference)

- Q. (By Mr. Shook) I take it, then, from your last answer, as best you know yourself, you believe that you can do that and make the decision just on what you hear in the courtroom?
  - A. Yes, sir.

Q. Okay. Fair enough. Let me -- you, obviously, believe in the death penalty and you put in your questionnaire that, you know, it just kind of depends on the facts of the case. In Texas the death penalty is reserved just for certain types of murder cases. We have some brutal murder cases that actually could never get the death penalty, but a lot of people wish we could.

But you have to go by certain guidelines. We have a life sentence. If I pull a gun out now and shoot Mr. Wirskye in the heart, I couldn't get the death penalty. Capital murder is an intentional murder that occurs with other aggravating factors, during the course of a felony, murder someone during a robbery, kidnapping, rape, during a burglary, that could be a death penalty case. Murder of a police officer, prison guard, or fireman while on duty, that could be a death penalty case, or child under the age of six, or multiple victims.

But those are the type of cases that are reserved for the death penalty. And I take it from the answers that you have in your questionnaire that you agree,

depending on the facts of the case, that those are the types of cases that you feel could be appropriate for the death penalty under the proper circumstances?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. A capital murder trial is divided into two parts like all criminal trials. We have the guilt/innocence stage where we have to prove the guilt. And if we fail to do that, it's a not guilty finding and everyone goes home. If we meet our burden of proof and prove the defendant guilty, we then move to the punishment phase.

At the close of the punishment phase, the jury gets these questions. We'll go over those in more detail in a minute. But, basically, it asks is the defendant a continuing danger to society? Did he cause the death or if he didn't cause the death, did he anticipate a death would be taken and is there any mitigating evidence where you think a life sentence should be imposed, rather than a death sentence?

and no, the defendant would be sentenced to death. If they are answered any other way, it's a life sentence. But those are the only two alternatives once you found him guilty. It will be a death sentence or life sentence. It all depends on how the questions are answered. We'll go over those in

more detail.

- A. Okay.
- Q. Going a little further, when we talk about capital murder we usually envision circumstances of a person, the triggerman, causing this. Now, in any type of crime you sometimes have more than one person committing the crime, groups of people who commit crimes. And the law says that if we actively participate, encourage, help commit a crime, we are all held responsible, even though someone may have a greater role.

The same is true of capital murder. The example I want to give you is Mr. Wirskye and I, let's say we want to rob a bank. Our plan is we'll go there. I have the gun. He knows that, but he's going to be the bag man. I hold the gun on everyone. He gathers up all the money.

At some point in time, maybe I start shooting the teller because I don't like him or Mr. Wirskye warns me they are going for an alarm or something and I shoot. We leave and we're caught. Obviously, I could be charged with a capital murder and could be prosecuted for the death penalty because I'm the triggerman.

Under our law Mr. Wirskye can, too, depending on the facts, because he actively participated in the crime. He was my accomplice. There's a couple of theories how that works, but the bottom line is this. He

could be prosecuted for capital murder, and depending on the facts, he could get the death penalty, even though he's the nontriggerman. Okay?

People feel differently about that law. Some people, if it were up to them, they have no problem with the death penalty for the triggerman. The accomplice that assisted in committing the offense, though, they have reservations about. But if it were up to them, they would have a different punishment, maybe just a long prison term for that person. Other people agree with the law and tell us, I agree with the law. Accomplices that are helping commit the capital murder should be held responsible, too, and ultimately could get the death penalty, depending on the facts, even if they are not the actual triggerman. It all comes down to the facts. But they agree with the law in that regard that the accomplices should be held responsible.

People differ on that. And I want to ask you how you feel about an accomplice being prosecuted for capital murder and ultimately receiving the death penalty.

Do you feel that's fair, depending on the facts of the particular case?

- A. On a capital murder trial?
- Q. Yes.

- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Do you feel it's fair that an

accomplice could actually get the death penalty, even though they didn!t actually pull the trigger, depending on the facts?

- A. That they could actually get the death penalty?
  - Q. Yes, ma'am.
  - A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Why is that?
- A. Because they were there. They were an accomplice to whatever is happening. They knew what was going to go on.
  - Q. Okay. So it depends on their role?
  - A. Depending on their role.
  - Q. And if they knew what was going on?
  - A. (Prospective juror nods head.)
- Q. Okay. Now, I want to talk about these Special Issues for a moment because you only get these in a death penalty case. You don't get to these Special Issues until or unless the defendant is found guilty. Once he's been found guilty, you can hear additional evidence, background evidence, good and bad, about a person's background, evidence, good and bad, about a person.

Go back into deliberations and you consider what you heard in the guilt/innocence stage and, also, any new background information, good and bad, you

heard about the individual and you answer these questions separately as a juror.

Now, as you know from growing up here, that everyone starts out with that presumption of innocence. The State has to prove a case beyond a reasonable doubt. And in the punishment stage on these first two questions, those start out with no answers and we have to prove the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that they should be answered yes. The burden of proof stays on us on the first question. We use the evidence of the crime itself.

So you go back and you have already made a decision on guilt/innocence, but you kind of look at that evidence again from a different angle and decide, okay, how that applies to question No. 1, has the State proven its case to me that he's a continuing danger and any new background information you have learned about him.

The question asks whether there's a probability that the defendant would commit criminal acts of violence that would constitute a continuing threat to society? It's asking the jurors to make a decision, do you think he's going to be a dangerous person and commit criminal acts of violence in the future? So it's asking you to make kind of a prediction of how they will behave in the future.

Do you feel comfortable in making that

decision, if you are given enough evidence?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Okay. Now, the evidence you can use is his role in the crime, what you found in the guilt/innocence stage, as well as if he's had a prior criminal record or lack of criminal record, you have seen a pattern before, that sort of thing. You can even hear from those witnesses on the previous crime, if they exist, or you can hear good character evidence. Maybe it's the first time he's ever done something.

We can't preview the facts for you. I could give you a whole bunch of scary facts or I could give you a whole bunch of facts that show the person is not dangerous. The point is this. As a juror you have to wait until all the evidence is in so you have all the information before you make that decision. Just because you found someone guilty of capital murder, proven beyond a reasonable doubt, you don't go and answer yes right away. It's no automatic answers. If they were automatic answers based on your guilty verdict, there wouldn't be any reason even to go through this process.

The law instructs the jurors and believes that the jurors should wait, listen to all the evidence, and then go back and deliberate and then make their decision based on the evidence. If you think beyond a reasonable

doubt that he is a continuing danger, you would answer the question that way. If you don't think the State has proven it, even though he's guilty of capital murder, you would answer it no, leave it as a no. And that's fine. You just have to call it the way you see it based on the evidence.

In other words, there's no automatic answers. Just because you found him guilty, you don't go check the yes off. It's just going to depend on the facts of that particular case. Do you feel that you can follow that portion of the law?

A. Yes, sir.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. And could you wait and require the State to prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt that it should be answered yes?
  - A. Yes.
- And could you -- would you not automatically answer yes just because you found him guilty? In other words, you would wait and listen to all the additional evidence in the punishment stage, then deliberate and then make your decision?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. Okay. So there wouldn't be an automatic yes?
  - A. I would wait.
  - Q. You would wait until you heard everything?
  - A. Yes.

A. Correct.

2

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Or if you buy a house, you want to get all the information before you make that type of decision. The same thing here. You can't have a knee-jerk reaction and answer these questions.

Question No. 2, that question asks whether the defendant actually caused the death of the deceased or did not actually cause the death of the deceased, but intended to kill the deceased or another or anticipated that a human life would be taken.

Now, it's complicated. We didn't write these questions. I want to let you know that. Someone down in the Legislature did that years ago, so they are not always that clear.

But the first part is pretty simple. If you believe from the evidence that he actually caused the death, that question could be answered yes. But the second part of the question has to do with the accomplice situation. If he didn't actually cause the death of the deceased, but his intention, he intended to kill the deceased or another person or he anticipated that a human

life would be taken, then you can answer it yes. And that's just based on the evidence.

If it's an accomplice situation and he didn't actually cause the death, but you feel from the role and how the crime occurred that he anticipated something like that would happen. In my situation Mr. Wirskye knew I had a gun and maybe he knew I was dangerous and that sort of thing. Then you could make the decision that way. So that encompasses the accomplice decision, but it's based simply on the person's role in the offense and anything that you have learned about him in the past, you know, in the punishment stage, that might help you know about their personality and what they are capable of.

Again, it starts out with a no answer and we have to prove to you it should be answered yes, just depending on the facts of the case. Do you feel that you could do that?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Okay. Just because you found him guilty or just because you have already answered question No. 1 yes, you don't automatically answer question No. 2 yes. It's an independent decision based on all the information. And you could follow the law?

This last Special Issue is the mitigation question and neither side has the burden of proof. We don't

have to prove it should be answered no and the defense doesn't have to prove it has to be answered yes. We will, obviously, argue that way, I'm sure, but there's no burden of proof like there is on the first two on us.

It asks whether taking into consideration all the evidence, including the circumstances of the offense, the defendant's character and background, and the personal moral culpability of the defendant, there is a sufficient mitigating circumstance or circumstances to warrant that a sentence of life imprisonment, rather than a death sentence, be imposed.

Now, the question gets kind of long, but, basically, it's saying is there anything in the case, maybe their role in the crime, something -- how they grew up, something in their background, if there's something that tells you in your heart that they should get a life sentence, rather than a death sentence, you can answer the question that way, if there's sufficient mitigating evidence. If there is not, you can leave it as no.

It allows the jurors to kind of look at everything and do what they think is right in the case. In other words, not every death penalty case where someone is found guilty is going to result in a death. You may find there is mitigating evidence in that particular case.

What mitigating evidence is, I can't tell

you. And the Judge won't give you a definition. Really, it's going to be up to you and the other jurors what you decide it is.

You know, we talk about a lot of things and it's just going to depend on the facts. It could be something in his background. Some people tell us if he grew up in a poor neighborhood or maybe he was abused physically or mentally, that might be mitigating evidence. Other jurors tell us, I feel bad for him, but, look, a lot of folks grew up in an abusive home and once they were an adult, they have to be held accountable and they wouldn't view that as mitigating.

There's no right or wrong answer on that.

Do you feel strongly one way or another on those types of issues?

- A. Well, I believe what you said that when you become an adult you are held accountable for what your actions are.
  - Q. Okay.

- A. I believe that when you are growing up, you do know the difference between right and wrong and you still know the difference between right and wrong when you get older.
- Q. A lot of people feel that way. Another issue that comes up is -- maybe here's one that many people feel

is mitigating. We talk about mental retardation, someone with a learning problem. It's not to the point where they don't know right from wrong, but it's something they were born with and they don't have a problem with. Maybe they, you know, they were just following along. It was a young person and they are not very intelligent. You may view that as mitigating.

It's just going to depend on the facts, things like that. As I said before, you don't have to tell us today what you think is mitigating. You don't have to tell the Court. All you have to be able to do as a juror is say, my mind will be open to that type of evidence and I will look at it and if I think in my heart and mind that something is sufficiently mitigating that I think the person's life should be spared and get a life sentence and they wouldn't walk out, I could answer the question that way. If I don't believe that way, I will answer it no, just base it on the facts of each case.

Do you feel that you can do that, keep your mind open to that evidence and then make the decisions?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Again, it's hard for us because we can't preview the facts. It's just something that you are going to have to wait and hear. You may, if you were on a hundred death penalty cases, there might be one where you

think there was a sufficient mitigating evidence for a life sentence or there might be 20 or 30 or 40, just depending on the facts of each case.

found he's a continuing danger to society or believe beyond a reasonable doubt he anticipated a life would be taken, there might be a fact situation where you think, even though I know those things, I also feel the right thing to do in this case would be to give a life sentence and you can do that, just depending on what the facts tell you to do? Again, the law contemplates that you will wait and make these decisions just based on the evidence and do that and just let the chips fall where they may and you feel you can do that?

- A. I don't know about letting the chips fall where they may. I would listen to the evidence.
- Q. What I mean by that is you make your decision based on the evidence?
- A. Yes. I would hear it all, but I think that depending on what he did in his past, I don't know if that comes up in the trial or not.
  - O. Yes.

A. I think if my decision that he was guilty, if I think -- if my decision that he was guilty, if things came up from his past, I don't know if that would have any waiver

on my decision.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Well, yeah. And we could go over hypothetical situations, I mean, situations, I mean, he's guilty and you think he's actively involved and he's been in the pen 20 times and done horrible things in the past. Obviously, that's probably going to weigh real harshly against him. Or you could have a situation where he's never been in trouble and some other mitigating facts.
  - A. Correct.
- Q. What I mean by that is it's going to depend on the facts.
  - A. Correct.
- Q. But you can wait and make that decision based on each case, whatever case you sat on, you would weigh and listen to everything and then make a decision?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And if you think the question should be answered yes, then give them a life sentence. You could answer it that way, if you believe that's what the evidence told you to do?
  - A. Yes, yeah.
- Q. Again, I can't preview the facts. I'm just asking you, can you keep your mind open and consider the question and then answer the question based on the facts?
  - A. Yes, I could do that.

Q. And if it's a yes, it's a yes. And if it's a no, it's a no. That's all I'm asking you to do and that's all the law contemplates you to do. When we start talking about this, usually we conjure up very bad crimes and sometimes that weighs on jurors' answers.

But I think what we need to emphasize is the bottom line is can you make the decision on the facts of each case and keep your mind open and then make the decision?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Let me go over a few rules that apply in every criminal case, not just this one. And you will be familiar with most of these. The presumption of innocence. At the beginning of the case the defendant is presumed to be innocent. The fact that he's been arrested, indicted, or that we're even going through this process is no evidence of his guilt. You have to wait and listen to the witnesses as they testify and then make your decision based on what they say.

You feel you can follow that rule of law, start the defendant off with that presumption of innocence and require us to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that he's guilty?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. As I said, that rule of law applies on

each case. Everyone starts out with that presumption and then we overcome it by putting on the evidence. That burden of proof never shifts to the defense. It stays on our table. Now, you can anticipate the defendant will try to prove his innocence or at least try to poke holes in the State, but they are not required to have a burden of proof. You can't require them to prove things. The requirement should be on the State here to prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt.

If they don't ask a question or raise a finger and at the close of all the evidence you don't think we have met our burden, you have a reasonable doubt in your mind, it's pretty simple, you find him not guilty. If you don't have a reasonable doubt and we have met our burden, you find him guilty. Again, it's just based on the evidence of each case.

But will you require us to prove beyond a reasonable doubt the defendant is guilty?

- A. Could I require you to prove to me?
- Q. Yes. The State, because that's the law.
- A. If that's the law.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. The law in each case is the State has that burden of proof.
- A. And the law is that all defendants are innocent until proven guilty.

Q. Right.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- A. But if I already had that feeling that he's guilty, am I answering incorrectly?
- Q. Again, that goes to the bottom line of what we talked about earlier. You have read about the case, like most of the jurors. And the bottom line comes down to this, can you just make your decisions based on the evidence you hear in the case? And I know you can't put it out of your mind, but you can't base your decisions on what you read or heard or seen on TV.

And this case, some people can do that, follow the law, because, obviously, what I said before is the good evidence or the reliable evidence is what you hear from the actual witness stand.

You told me earlier you thought you could do that. You could -- and when you say you could do that, what you will have to be able to do is presume him innocent and require us to prove the case beyond a reasonable doubt. In other words, you can't say I saw this stuff on TV, so I think he's guilty already.

- A. I understand. I will follow the law.
- Q. Okay. Do you feel that you can give him that presumption of innocence?
- A. I would have to, if I'm going to follow the law.

- Q. And you feel that you can follow the law?
- A. It would be my duty to follow the law, yes.
- Q. And you would be able to do that in this case?
- A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Now, that burden of proof goes to every portion of the indictment. We have to prove everything we allege in the indictment. We have to prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt. And if we fail on just one element of that offense, one portion of it, then you would have to find the defendant not guilty.

Let me give you a couple of examples. If at the end of the trial you are not sure we proved the identity of the killer, who the person was that committed the offense, obviously, that's a reasonable doubt. It's a pretty simple example. You would find him not guilty.

Another example we give is the county.

We have to prove it happened in Dallas County. I don't
anticipate this happening, but I like to give a way-out,
kind of a way-out example to demonstrate how the law works.

We prove everything else to you, who the person was, how
they committed the offense, who they murdered, but you had a
reasonable doubt about the county, maybe it actually
happened in another county, Ellis County, Kaufman County.

You would have to acquit the defendant and find him not
guilty.

Now, that would be a horrible mistake on our part. We, obviously, would be fired if we made that type of horrible error in our preparations and I don't anticipate something like that would happen. But the point of that example is this. The jury can't help us out. If we screw up that badly and miss out on our burden, you can't say, well, I'm going to say I'm going to give them that one. I'm going to ignore the fact that they have totally messed this case up. You have to be, as a juror, kind of like a referee, you know, just call balls and strikes -- or an umpire, call balls and strikes. You can't give us a helping hand. You have to follow the law and find the defendant not guilty, if you required us to prove our case beyond a reasonable doubt on every portion of the indictment on this case. Can you do that?

A. Yes.

Q. In a criminal trial, if a person or defendant wants to testify, he can. No one can stop him. He can tell his story, you know, judge him like you would any other witness. If he chooses not to testify, the Judge would instruct you that you can't hold that against him. In other words, you would have to make your decision just based on all the other evidence you heard in the case. You can't say, well, I think he's guilty because he didn't testify. There could be a lot of reasons why someone would choose not

to testify.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

They could be very guilty and look bad.

They might actually not make a good witness. They could be nervous. They could be not educated very well and an experienced prosecutor could make them look bad. There are -- they could be following the advice of their lawyers. I don't think they have proven their case and I don't want you to say anything. There could be a number of reasons.

The law says if a person chooses not to incriminate themselves or not testify, just don't pay attention to it and base your decision based on everything else. Could you follow that rule?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Police officers testify oftentimes in criminal cases. A lot of people have respect for the job they do. But police officers have to be judged like any other witness. There is some good ones. There's some bad ones. You can't start them out ahead of the other witnesses. You have to judge them, judge their credibility as a witness when they hit the witness stand.

Could you do that, judge them as you would any other witness, judge their credibility?

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. All right. Sometimes we hear about parole laws, that sort of thing, that are in the news. Makes a lot

of controversy sometimes. But what the Judge will instruct you in this type of case is if a defendant gets a capital life case, he would have to stay in prison forty calendar years, day for day, before they become eligible for parole, and then that doesn't mean they are paroled out. That means they become eligible.

The other instruction they give you is this. You can't consider the parole laws in making your decisions. You have to consider a life sentence to be a life sentence, because someone else makes those decisions. Do you feel that you could follow that rule?

A. Yes.

Q. The bottom line is this, I think that you would be able to do this, is, again, as a juror, you would have to wait and listen to all the evidence before you make your decisions, guilt/innocence stage, or how these questions should be answered, and then answer them the way the evidence tells you to answer them.

Some cases could call for a death penalty and other cases might call for a life sentence. Some would be guilty and some not guilty. It would just depend on the facts of each case.

Also, as we talked about several times, comes down to this. You have to make your decisions based solely on what you hear in the case, not on anything that

you have read or heard about. And you feel you can do that? Yes. Α., Okay. Do you have any questions over anything that I have gone over? It's cold up here, though. I'm shaking. No. I appreciate your patience for everything I 0. have gone over and that's all the questions I have. A. Thank you for mine. MS. BUSBEE: Can we have a moment? 10 Approach the bench? 11 THE COURT: You may. (Bench conference) 12 CROSS-EXAMINATION 13 BY MR. SANCHEZ: 14 Q. Good morning. 15 Good morning. 16 Α. How are you doing? 0. 17 18 Α. Good. 19 Ο. Good. My name is Juan Sanchez. I'm going to ask you some questions that have to do with some of your 20 answers that you have given already, some things that we 21 want to explore. Okay? 22 Α. Okay. 23 Q. But before we start that -- and have you ever 24 called in to "The Ticket" yourself or you just listen to it? 25

- A. I just listen to it.
- Q. You have never been P1 (phonetic)?
- A. I don't know if I can, I'm considered a P1 but, I listen to it all day.
- Q. But you expressed in your answers that deep down you feel that he's already guilty of what they are charging him with, Mr. Murphy here, is that true?
  - A. Yes.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. And why do you feel that's he's guilty already?
- A. Because he was with all the other people and he contributed to that day.
- Q. And I saw that you had strong feelings, I mean, you got emotional up on the stand when the State was asking you questions. Did you follow this closely in the newspaper when this happened?
- A. Well, just by reading about it and on TV and just the emotional situation that happened with his family and members of the family.
- Q. Did you follow that closely while it was happening?
  - A. I don't know how closely you mean. Just by --
- Q. How closely did you follow that? Did you look in the paper for it while it was happening? Did you get on the Internet?

- A. No, I did not get on the Internet. I listened to it when the news came on, whenever I had the news on.
- Q. And in your heart, your gut, you feel he's already guilty of what they are charging him with before you heard evidence, based on what you know already?
- A. Based on what I know already. But I also told the prosecutors that I could listen to all the evidence given to me before making a final decision.
- Q. And I understand that's what you told them, but would that in some way play a part in you listening to this case? I know it's not easy to put it out of your mind, but deep down if you are sitting in those chairs over there, are you going to be remembering everything that you read or be affected emotionally like you were today by what you know already?
- A. I can't -- I can't see what's in the future.

  I think that I can't tell you whether I would get emotional or not. I probably would.
  - Q. It's possible?

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. It could be possible.
- Q. Also, when you first started answering questions, you indicated that you thought the death penalty should be given for this offense; is that correct? Is that the way you said that?
  - A. If that's what I said.

- Q. What did you mean by that?
- A. The severity of it.
- Q. Okay. And were you talking about this, the specific facts of this case or just any case where an officer may be killed?
- A. Well, I believe that when any officer is killed, the only purpose of killing an officer is to get away.
- Q. And do you believe that that should be an automatic death penalty at that point? I mean, once you find somebody guilty of killing a police officer, do you believe that should be an automatic?
  - A. You mean without a trial?

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. No. Once you had a trial. You don't have to go over all the Special Issues that you have over here that the death penalty should be assessed at that point. Do you think that?
  - A. No. I believe that you should have these.
- Q. That's my concern is that you said that the death penalty should be given in cases like this one. And were you talking specifically about the facts of this case? Is that what you were talking about?
  - A. Like, I don't know. I guess so.
- Q. You can't -- remember, the law said -- I know it's hard to remember what you were saying, what you meant

exactly at that time, but is that possible that you have already made up your mind that if you were to convict Mr.

Murphy of this offense, that the death penalty would be the first thing on your mind for you --

- A. I think it's on anybody's mind. I mean, I don't think it's just me.
- Q. Is it possible would that be on your mind before you even looked at the Special Issues?
- A. I think it would be, but I could be openminded and go through those Special Issues as the evidence was presented to me.
- Q. And as you were looking at those Special Issues, would you be -- would you already start -- let me put it this way. When you talk about the Special Issues and you found somebody guilty of capital murder, that person is basically sitting on a life sentence unless you can answer those questions in the way that -- the way the State talked to you about. Does that make sense to you? In other words, it's a life sentence. You found somebody guilty of capital murder, it's a life sentence at that point and unless you can answer those Special Issues in the way that the State talked about, then it would stay a life sentence. Does that make sense to you?
  - A. Uh-huh.

Q. In other words, those would be three hurdles

or three things that would have to happen, three different decisions, that would have to occur before somebody could be assessed a death penalty. Does that make sense to you?

- A. Yes.
- Q. And based on the fact that you already feel he's guilty of this offense, could you really hold the State to their burden of proof, burden in proving Special Issue No. 1 and Special Issue No. 2 to prove those beyond a reasonable doubt?
  - A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. You would require them to do that?
- A. Isn't that the law? I mean, that's the law.
- Q. I know that's the law, but could you do it?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Would the fact that you already feel he's guilty before we start the trial in any way cause you to lessen their burden?
  - A. I don't think so.
- Q. You don't think so? And when I hear "I don't think so", that means it could also --
  - A. It's not a definite, is it?
  - Q. Exactly.
- A. I believe that I could go through these issues and answer it with the evidence given to me.
  - Q. What do you think about a life sentence in

prison? What do you think about that when you hear that somebody receives a life sentence in a capital offense?
What do you think about that? Do you have any feelings that way?

- A. No. I mean, that's the way the jury decided.
- Q. What would be your personal feelings about it? Would it be a disappointment to you if somebody received a life sentence or would you say probably that's what that person deserved in that case? What are your feelings about that?
  - A. Each case is different, so it depends.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Do you think a life sentence is a deterrent, as opposed to the death penalty being assessed?
- A. I don't -- I don't know. A deterrent? I don't believe it's a deterrent. I don't understand -- I don't understand what you mean by --
- Q. What are your general feelings about someone receiving a life sentence? Do you think it's a severe punishment or do you think it's not a severe punishment?
- A. I believe it's a severe punishment in a way that that person will possibly never see the outdoors again and he won't be able to enjoy the things that other people do. I mean, that is a punishment in itself when you are in a cell.
  - Q. Do you think that could ever be an appropriate

punishment in a capital murder case?

- A. An appropriate?
- Q. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- A. Gosh, I don't believe so.
- Q. And you think that would affect?
- A. I don't know -- I've answered some questions one way and here I'm answering yours the other way and I feel that I'm not --
- Q. That's why we ask these questions, both sides have equal time to ask questions. But the fact that you don't believe it would ever be an appropriate sentence in a capital case, that would somehow affect you answering these Special Issues?
  - A. Would you repeat the question? I'm sorry.

MR. SHOOK: Approach the bench?

THE COURT: Just a minute.

(Bench conference)

THE COURT: Ms. Garber, you are cold this morning. Yesterday we were all. They can never get it properly adjusted. We appreciate your time and service here today, but the parties have agreed that this is not going to be the case for you. You probably know just a little too much and have your opinions just a little too cemented to be on this jury and we appreciate your honesty. That's the main thing. You have learned a lot about the law, probably

more than you ever wanted to know.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

.19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I found it interesting.

THE COURT: And this process for you today will be concluded. Thank you for your time and service to the Court and you are free to go.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you.

[Prospective juror out]

THE COURT: Let the record reflect that the parties have previously scheduled to talk to juror No. 672, Mr. Kenneth Lewis Chance. The Court has had contact with the mother of Mr. Chance and the employer of Mr. Chance and he is somewhere in Eastern Europe, far deep undercover, working under the United Nations assignment and has been unable to have contact in the last two weeks.

Mr. Wirskye, any problem with the State agreeing to excuse this juror?

MR. WIRSKYE: No, none from the State.

THE COURT: Defense?

MS. BUSBEE: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: The Court will excuse

Mr. Chance. For the record the other agreement we have is to move Mr. Frank Arena from Thursday, September 4, to Friday, September 5. I will print a new schedule accordingly. That will conclude this morning's voir dire

and reassemble at 1:15 for the afternoon.

(Recess)

THE COURT: Brad Richards.

[Prospective juror in]

THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Richards.

How are you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good.

THE COURT: Welcome to the 283rd and thank you for being here on time. Have you had enough time to review the outline that I gave you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: And the bottom line is, I believe you said in your questionnaire, understand you were sworn to tell the truth. I think your quote stood out in my mind. If called back, "I will answer all questions truthfully." And I appreciate that very much. My job is to be sure that you understand the law.

If you have read that, you can see it can get complicated pretty quick.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah.

THE COURT: So the lawyers are going to spend some time with you to go over those issues and be sure that you understand them.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.

THE COURT: And then, once again, if you

25

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

have any questions in this process, please discuss it. Ιf you don't understand, they want to shade a different direction, just say so. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay. THE COURT: Many people look at this as an intimidating process. You might be on trial. That's not the issue. But it's the only way that we can actually talk to an individual juror. And the key is that you understand the law. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay. THE COURT: The only question that I have for you before I let the lawyers voir dire is we have scheduled this trial to begin on November 10th, two weeks, as I said in my outline. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. THE COURT: Do you have any problem serving the Court for those two weeks? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Shook? BRAD RICHARDS, having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

## **DIRECT EXAMINATION**

## BY MR. SHOOK:

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. My name is Toby Shook and I'm going to ask you

questions on behalf of the State this afternoon. As the Judge said, we're just interested in your honest opinions and we try to stay somewhat informal. If you have any questions at any time, feel free to ask. Okay?

A. Okay.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Usually we select jurors for most cases just out of a panel. But because it's a capital murder case in which we're seeking the death penalty, we have this procedure where we talk to each juror individually. You provided us with a lot of valuable information in your questionnaire and we appreciate you taking the time. I know it was a lot of questions. Believe it or not, it actually saves you time when you come down here. And I'm going to ask you just a few questions off of that, do some followup questions. We'll talk about capital murder, the death penalty, and how you feel about that and some of the rules and laws that apply to that type of case.
  - A. Okay.
- Q. You are currently employed with the Dallas County Appraisal?
  - A. Central Appraisal District.
  - Q. Yes.
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And have been doing that a little over a year, I think?

- A. Three and a half years.
- Q. Okay. I know we have always -- we've used y'all's website, I know a good source for looking at houses and good background information. I think everyone else does that, too, nowadays, all on the web. But I was also looking at -- we asked about past work history and it intrigues me that you used to work for the Texas Rangers Ball Club?
- A. Yes. I was assistant groundskeeper for 11 years.
  - Q. What years were you out there from?
- A. I was out there from '81 through '97, full-time from '87 to '97.
  - Q. So you were at both ballparks?
  - A. Yes, sir. I helped build the new one.
- Q. New one. Do you still go to a lot of games out there at the new one?
  - A. Two or three a year.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. It's a nice ballpark. I'm always amazed how they keep that thing that green and the way the field drains so quickly and that sort of thing.
  - A. Yeah, a lot of sand.
- Q. Let me talk to you a little bit about capital murder. You know it's a death penalty case in which the State is seeking the death penalty. And you have told us on your questionnaire that you do believe in the death penalty

as a law.

What I want to do is just ask you to follow up on that a little bit and tell us why you believe in the death penalty or what purpose you think the death penalty serves in our society?

A. Well, I think, like I answered in the questionnaire, if someone were to go on trial and it proved beyond a reasonable doubt that he did, you know, take another's life, I mean, I'm not -- I think I said in there I don't believe so much an eye for an eye as far as like if you steal, you know, cut your hand off or if you lie, you know, cut your tongue out like they did in the Biblical stories, but just, you know, as far as, you know, I'm a religious guy and I just feel that, you know, if you take someone's life, you know, you should pay with your own.

There are advocates that feel that spending the rest of your life in jail, that's a harder -- that would be a harder sentence than just someone, you know, being put to death by lethal injection. Some people feel that's an easier way out. I mean, there's arguments to both sides, but I just feel if you do take someone -- or someone's life, that you should pay with your own life.

Q. Okay. And I think that you also put in the questionnaire that it depends on -- it's appropriate in some murder cases. Basically, it comes down to the particular

facts of that case?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Some cases it might be appropriate and other cases another punishment might be appropriate?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. Just depending on those particular facts?
  - A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Okay. I take it that this is something you believed in as a law for some time, most of your adult life or since you have matured. Have you always been in favor of capital punishment?
  - A. Yes, I have.
- Q. Okay. In Texas the death penalty is reserved not for every type of murder case. We have reserved it just for exclusive types. We have a host of murder cases, brutal murder cases, in which someone gets a life sentence. The death penalty is reserved for murder cases, intentional killing, not legal justification, not accident, or self-defense, but a killing that occurred during an aggravated fact.

If you murder someone during the course of another felony, such as robbing someone, 7-Eleven clerk, if you shoot the clerk, that could be a death penalty case. Breaking into someone's home, killing someone in the house, that could be a death penalty case because you are

committing that felony. Also, during a kidnapping or during a rape or arson. Those could all be death penalty cases, also.

Specific types of victims come under the statute. Murdering a police officer on duty, a fireman on duty, a prison guard on duty, it could be a death penalty case. Murdering someone for profit or money. If you are a hitman-type situation, that could be one. Murder of a child under the age of six could be a capital case. And then murder of more than one person like a mass murder or serial killer situation could be a death penalty case. But those are the types of specific cases we reserve for consideration of the death penalty.

Does that list fit your definition, your personal definition of types of cases you think could be appropriate, depending on the facts of those cases?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Let me go over another area while I'm on that. When we think of capital murder, we usually think of the examples that come to mind is the actual triggerman. If I went into a 7-Eleven store, robbed it, the clerk, and then shot him during the course of that, that's what you think of as the actual triggerman.

The law says that when someone commits a felony or any type of crime, if more than one person assists

them, if there is an accomplice, they call it, those people can be held responsible, also. Sometimes it takes more than one person to commit a crime. It takes groups of people. They may have different roles in the crime, but if they are all assisting, aiding, abetting, helping commit that crime, then they can all be held responsible, even though some had greater roles.

And the same is true for capital murder.

An example I give often is say Mr. Wirskye and I and another individual wants to rob a bank. I may have the gun. That's the plan. I go in with the gun. Mr. Wirskye has a bag.

We're going to put the money in. He goes in the bank with me and the other guy waits out in the getaway car. He's going to warn us if somebody is coming. He will have the car running so we can have a fast getaway.

I cover everybody, threaten them, and then Mr. Wirskye goes and empties the cash registers. We're working as a team. Maybe at some point in time somebody tries to run out of the bank, they say something I don't like, or maybe Mr. Wirskye sees them go for an alarm and tells me and I shoot them.

We leave the bank and we're arrested soon after. I'm, obviously, the one that killed that person. I could be prosecuted for capital murder. I could get the death penalty because I'm the triggerman. The law says that

Mr. Wirskye could, also, be prosecuted because he's actively participating in it and the same for the getaway driver, just depending on the facts, because they actively participated in that event, even though they didn't actually pull the trigger. They could even ultimately get the death penalty, depending on the facts.

think that the law should apply to accomplices to deter them. Other people draw a line that -- they're for the death penalty for a triggerman in those situations, but they would not want the death penalty or capital murder to apply to accomplices, maybe a long prison term or some other term, but it just doesn't set with them. How do you feel about that? Do you think accomplices should be prosecuted and ultimately receive the death penalty, depending on the facts, or would you only reserve the death penalty, if it was up to you, for the actual triggerman?

A. I think it would just depend on the evidence. But I would be more inclined to -- I mean, I guess the circumstance could be, you know, brought down to where say maybe the getaway driver and the guy that's holding the money, maybe those three made a pact they are not going to kill anybody, if something like that were to come out, and he on his own, did that. I would probably be more inclined, the guy that was just bagging the money and getaway driver,

you know, maybe not the death penalty for those.

- Q. Okay.
- A. That's not to say I don't believe in it.

  That's what I put on my questionnaire. I think there are circumstances that even accomplices would be associated with capital, you know, crime, such as you described that they might not be charged with the death penalty.
- Q. Is it something that you believe that if it were up to you, we could make you king of Texas or Governor of Texas, king of Texas, and if you were to decide about our death penalty laws, would you have a death penalty for an accomplice or would you put it just for the triggerman, the person that actually caused the death?
- A. I think that I would probably be more inclined to have it for the triggerman.
  - Q. And would not have it for the accomplices?
  - A. No.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. And let me get into one other area I meant to ask you about. Everyone has -- just about everyone has seen some media coverage concerning this event. I believe you saw some of it on radio? Television?
- A. I think on that I put I was unfamiliar with this.
- Q. Well, there was another -- there was another portion and it's been a while since we asked this question

and I know you don't have the questionnaire in front of you, but we asked this question, have you ever watched any TV shows or movies or read any books, articles, dealing with the death penalty or life on death row and you said, yeah. You said, "I saw the media coverage concerning the Texas Seven and have seen TV shows and movies where this has been a subject."

A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Are those some -- what shows were those?
- A. Probably, you know, in the past I've seen, you know, various "Law and Order" shows. I watch that CSI every once in a while on Thursday.
- Q. The coverage on the Texas Seven, was that one of the documentaries they had on it?
- A. No. I think it was probably just watching the news every night, just them leading into when it all broke out and it sort of went away for a little bit. And then I drive by the courthouse every day like on my way to work, so as those guys were going on trial, you know, you would see the Channel 8 and Channel 5. I didn't actually see the media coverage, but I saw the vans out in the morning and the news like at night 6:00 and 10:00. The first for or five went on trial here.
  - Q. Did you follow those cases very closely?
  - A. No, not very closely.

Q. We can't get into the actual facts of the case, but this is one of the Texas Seven trials. They've been going on for some time. Obviously, a lot of people have seen coverage of it when it first happened and followed it. We can't get into the general facts, but, obviously, there was a lot of media coverage. I can tell you that Mr. Murphy is one of the persons involved in that, according to our allegations. We're prosecuting him concerning the shooting that happened at the Oshman's back in December of 2000.

A. Okay.

Q. So what I need to ask you now is this, now that you know that, how that publicity might affect you as a juror. The law is this. Just because you have seen publicity doesn't mean that makes you ineligible to be a juror. It just depends on if you made up your mind or it might affect you in some way. The Judge would instruct you if you have seen any media coverage, we want you to put that out of your mind and not let that affect your decision, just make your decision on in the court.

Some people can do that and some people can't. Some people have watched the coverage more than others and sometimes that affects their decisionmaking process. They will tell us, I've already made up my mind as far as guilt/innocence or the punishment and that sort of

thing. It just comes down to that individual and how much they observed it, what kind of opinions they formed and how strongly they formed those opinions, to be quite frank with you.

Now that you know this is actually one of the Texas Seven cases, do you think that would affect you in any way?

- A. I don't think it would.
- Q. Okay. Do you think you would be able to ignore what you have read and seen and decide the case just on its merits?
  - A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Okay. Now, let me get back to this accomplice business. Saying what you said that if it was up to you, you probably wouldn't have the death penalty for an accomplice. I will, also, tell you this now, that we're prosecuting the defendant under the theory of parties as an accomplice, not the actual triggerman.

Knowing how you feel about that, do you think then, you could ever assess the death penalty to someone who is not the actual triggerman, but just an accomplice situation?

A. I think I could. I think before I answered it, it would just depend on the circumstances and the evidence that was, you know, provided.

- Q. Okay. What would be important to you, then, in that situation?
  - A. As far as, you know --

- Q. If we're trying someone who was just an accomplice and not the actual triggerman.
- A. I guess, like I said before, just the intent that they had, you know, when they went there. I mean, did they have any intent of actually killing anybody? Did they even care, you know, if they did? Were they just going there -- even though he wasn't the triggerman, you know, was it a group of them that just said, regardless, this is how we're going? If anybody gets in our way, any one of us could have shot. It just happens maybe it was one or two. That would be stuff that would be brought out in the trial, like the example I mentioned before like the guy in the car, sitting in the car. They, like, made a pact, just saying no one is going to get hurt because we don't want anything like that to happen and that guy would just -- I mean, that would be, I guess, hard to prove that.
  - Q. That would be my followup question.
- A. It would be like just -- be like if they went on trial, I guess, separately, would be like one's word against another, I guess. It would be hard to believe, you know, which one was telling the truth. I mean, I can see it would be like a question if you were saying, like, we just

went in and somebody got in our way, we were going to do it and the other guy was maybe trying to save his skin and say, no, we said we weren't going to do this.

So I guess you just have to, you know, just hear the evidence and --

Q. The followup question, I think you answered it, would be hard to do sometimes. One thing, we may not know if they ever made a pact. Obviously, they -- if you are trying someone, the defendant doesn't take the stand, and you may only have the evidence there of what happened at the scene.

Now, jurors can infer someone's intent from the facts of the offense, how had he acted, how the killing took place, and that sort of thing, to look at someone's intent. Do you believe you can determine someone's intent by what happened at the offense, how the crime actually occurred? That sort of thing?

- A. That question meaning -- you mean, like another juror being able to persuade you?
  - Q. No, whether you as a juror --
  - A. As a juror.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. -- could determine the defendant's intent from the facts of the case, how the crime was planned, how it went down, how brutal it was, their response when it occurred, that sort of thing, what happened afterwards, all

their actions. You know, the State could argue what would these actions show? This had to be their intent. Look what they did. And the defense could argue another way, but you may never have evidence of, well, they had a big meeting.

A. Yeah.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. And they decided this and that sort of thing.

Most of the time that's what happens in cases. Lawyers make reasonable deductions from the evidence and argue the case, here's what the facts show. This had to be their intent.

Some jurors can do that if they feel they can make judgments about people's intent just by their actions. Other jurors can't.

It's -- I just wanted to ask you how you feel about that? Do you think you can judge a person's intent? For instance, we're talking about intent to kill for an accomplice from the way the crime actually occurred?

- A. I think I could.
- Q. What would be important to you about that?
- A. About determining, like, their intent?
- Q. Yes.
- A. Well, I mean, I guess it would just depend if he actually, you know, took the stand and it would just be the evidence that would be presented by the witnesses or --
- Q. The Fifth Amendment may come into play in that the defendant does not have to take the stand. He may

exercise his Fifth Amendment right and then never testify.

So we may never hear from the defendant. In fact, that often happens. And the Court will instruct you that you can't consider that as evidence of his guilt one way or the other.

Some people can do that. Some people can't. Would you be able to consider, follow that instruction, and not consider that as evidence against him, if he did not testify?

- A. I think I could.
- Q. Okay. Then if that situation occurs, you don't have his version or his story.
  - A. You just --

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. You just have the evidence as it was presented. Do you think that you could determine a person's intent from circumstantial evidence of what happened there?
- A. I think I could. I mean, we basically -- we would have to.
- Q. Okay. Let me ask you, then, if it gets down to it, you do feel, then, in the prosecution of someone who is not the actual triggerman, a party to the offense, an accomplice to the offense, that you could, if the evidence showed you, sentence him to death, even though, you know, he's not the triggerman?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. Okay. Let me let you take a moment. I want to talk to you about these Special Issues. If you would, look at Special Issue No. 1 and read that to yourself.
- A. [Prospective juror complies.] Just read No. 1?
- Q. Yeah. We'll go over the other two in a minute. No. 1, that question is asking you to make a prediction about how the defendant would behave in the future, whether there's a probability he would commit criminal acts of violence that would be a continuing threat to society.

Do you feel you could make that type of prediction, if you are given sufficient evidence? Predict someone's future behavior that way?

- A. I guess that would be hard to do. I guess, basically, all you could do is be presented what he's done in the past.
  - Q. All right.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. You just have to make -- I mean, you have to use your own judgment to what he's done in the past and what happened to him when he was incarcerated. I guess you just have to predict, use your own judgment, and predict what he would do.
- Q. What type of evidence would be important to you? What's done in the past? If he had done anything

wrong in the past?

- A. I mean, I would think to make a future prediction, I mean, obviously, you don't know the gentleman personally like, you know, like your brother or friend. You don't know how he acted. You would be presented with evidence, I guess, of past crimes, past behaviors. You know, just look at that, look at that to try to make a future determination. I mean, it's hard.
- Q. That type of evidence is admissible in that portion of the trial. But you don't get to those issues unless you have found the defendant guilty. But if they do have a past, if they've been to prison, committed criminal offenses, you can hear about those and hear from the witnesses, if they are available, to help you determine. You can, also, have the facts of the offense to tell you whether you think this person would be dangerous, how that crime was committed.

When we use the word there's a "probability" that the defendant would commit criminal acts, what does "probability" mean to you?

- A. There's a good chance.
- Q. Okay. How about committing "criminal acts of violence"? What do those words mean to you?
- A. Be severe criminal acts, more of the severity like armed robbery, murder, just not -- I mean, I guess

criminal acts, I guess, is speeding ticket or just shoplifting to see, you know, criminal act, you think more of like murder, aggravated assault, your more severe crimes.

- Q. And constituting a continuing threat to society. What does "society" mean to you?
- A. Society, the general population. I guess, you know, the area that he's living in, the other people.
- Q. Anyone and everyone that he may come into contact with?
  - A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Including people down in the prison system?
- A. Yes, just anywhere.
- Q. Question No. 1 you don't get to until you have found the defendant guilty of capital murder. At that point in time you can hear additional evidence of his background and then you get these questions. Question No. 1 starts out with a no answer. The State has to prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt it should be answered yes. The law says that just because you found him guilty of capital murder, you don't -- you don't automatically answer yes or find he's dangerous. You would have to depend on the facts. You would have to wait and require the State to prove that to you beyond a reasonable doubt. Could you do that?
  - A. I believe I could.
  - Q. Just because you found him guilty, you

wouldn't automatically answer No. 1 yes?

A. That's correct.

Q. Okay. Special Issue No. 2 asks whether the defendant actually caused the death of the deceased or did not actually cause the death of the deceased, but intended to kill the deceased or another or anticipated that a human life would be taken. That's the question that deals with the accomplice or the parties, as we call them.

First part, if you believe he actually caused the death, you could answer that yes. But the second part is he didn't actually cause the death of the deceased, but intended to kill the deceased or another or anticipated that a human life would be taken. You understand that part about we have to prove that he anticipated that a human life would be taken?

- A. I think I understand that.
- Q. What type of evidence or facts would be important to you? How could the State ever prove that to you that someone anticipated?
- A. I guess it would just be other's testimony that you would be relying on. I guess you would have to believe what they are saying. I think like we were saying before, when they went up there, even though he wasn't the triggerman, they probably, you know, if they were all armed, you know, they were just saying no one could get in their

way or stop them, it could be any one of them. It was just a circumstance to where the unfortunate victim was at that time and where they were spaced. It could have been any one of them, you know, that killed him.

So it would be the anticipating that that life would be taken. I mean, if he was -- I mean, like the defendant was in the back of the store and the front of the store, just depending on where the victim was at the time something went wrong. I mean, any one of them could have pulled the trigger, which is probably saying, you know, all of them did.

- Q. Do you think, then, those type of circumstances where everyone is armed and maybe they're violent men or something, that even if it's another part of the store, they all should be held responsible?
- A. Yes. Because what I was saying before, like your example about the three men robbing the bank, if only one of them is armed, you are more liable to believe the other two saying they didn't anticipate taking a life because they were not armed, you know. You might be more likely to believe those two guys sitting out in the car, the guy bagging money or where they sort of had a pact where they weren't going to kill anybody and the guy with the gun did it. Obviously, if they weren't armed, they weren't going to be taken alive, but, then again, it would be hard

to make the determination. Those three could have said, you know, if we got to get away, you know, just be one is against the other.

I think in this case where all of them were armed, if they were all spread out just at the time something went wrong, any one of them could have taken one or more person's life. So I think they should all be held accountable in that situation like that.

- Q. So it makes a big difference to you if they are all armed? It kind of goes to their intent, that sort of thing?
- A. I would say that would go for more for their intent.
- Q. And that's the situation where you think the accomplices could be prosecuted for the death penalty?
  - A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Let's talk about Special Issue No. 3. This question is kind of long. It's the mitigation question. You don't get to it unless you have found the defendant guilty, unless you have found he's a continuing danger to society, and unless you have found that he intended for the person to die or anticipated a person would die as a party, then you get to this last Special Issue, which is the mitigating question. Neither side has the burden of proof.

It asks you to look at all the evidence that's been presented and then answer the question. If you would, take a minute to read question No. 3 to yourself.

A. (Prospective juror complies.)

Q. That question covers a lot of areas. It asks you to take into consideration all the evidence, circumstances of the offense, the defendant's character and background, and personal moral culpability of the defendant. It lets you look at everything, you know, how the offense occurred, then if there's any previous crimes he's committed, any good things he's done in his life, all that stuff, good and bad, and you look at it all. Then you decide if there's sufficient mitigating circumstances that would warrant a sentence of life in prison, rather than death.

I can't tell you what mitigating evidence is going to be. It would be up to you and the other jurors. You don't even have to agree with the other jurors. I'll give you an example. You may have sat on a case -- you can sit on a case and the evidence might show the defendant went to Harvard and got three or four degrees. One juror might say that's mitigating because he's smart and did something with his life. And another juror might say, I would hold that against him. That's aggravating. Someone that has that opportunity or kind of brains shouldn't commit offenses

like this.

A. Uh-huh.

Q. We go over different areas and you don't have to agree or disagree with any of them. But for one example, we talk about a person's background, the way they were raised. You know, someone may come from a poor background. Perhaps they had a broken home or they were physically or mentally abused as a child. Some jurors tell us that could potentially be mitigating because it's a child in that shape. And other jurors tell us, you know, I feel bad about that, but a lot of people have a bad background and they don't go out killing people and that sort of thing. You have to be held accountable when you grow up.

How do you feel about that type of information?

- A. I think I go with what you said on the latter, you know, it's probably too bad that something like that happened, but, I mean, you know, it's up to you to make a change.
- Q. Okay. It kind of -- you don't -- you are not required to tell us what you think mitigating evidence would be. You just have to be able to tell the Judge I can keep my mind open to it and if I think there's something sufficiently mitigating, I can answer the question that way. Do you think that you can keep your mind open?

- A. Yes.
- Q. As you sit here today, does anything come to mind that you might view as potentially mitigating evidence?
  - A. In this particular trial or just --
  - Q. General.
  - A. For that Special Issue No. 3?
  - O. Yes.
  - A. Not offhand, really.
- Q. Most jurors don't. We recognize that hopefully you are not sitting around thinking about these types of things, but you think that you can keep your mind open to it?
  - A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Now, the procedures are the same in every capital case. If you find the defendant guilty, you would move on to the punishment phase. And if the State proved to you beyond a reasonable doubt that question No. 1 should be answered yes, question No. 2 should be answered yes, and if you answered no to the mitigating issue question, the Judge would sentence the defendant to death. If you answered the questions any other way, he would get a life sentence.

Those are the only two possible outcomes, a death or life sentence, based on how you answer those questions.

Are you familiar with the method of execution in Texas?

- A. I believe it's lethal injection.
- Q. That's correct. It's in the news a lot. Are you aware that Texas leads the nation in executions?
  - A. I've heard that on the news.

Q. It's true. There's in excess, usually, of 30 executions or more a year in Texas. The procedures are the same in this case. If the questions were answered yes, yes, and no, the Judge would sentence the defendant to death. He would be housed on death row.

At some point in time, the Judge would actually set a date of execution. On that date he would be given time with family, friends, a minister, a last meal.

But at 6:00 p.m. the execution will take place in

Huntsville. He's put on a gurney, strapped down. There's needles placed in his arm and witnesses come into the viewing room and view the execution. At that point in time the warden signals and substances are injected which stop his heart and his lungs. It happens in about 15 seconds.

It's a punishment that actually occurs in Texas. And you have told us philosophically the way you were raised that you believe in the death penalty for certain crimes, kind of told us that you understand the kind of rules or the procedures that they set out.

It's one thing to talk about being in favor of the death penalty and it's another thing when you

get down here on a jury and think a little more and actually participate in this event. You know yourself a lot better, obviously, than we will ever be able to know you. I just want to ask you this. As best you know yourself, if we put you on this jury and we prove these things to you like we think we can, because we fully anticipate we will prove the guilt and how these questions should be answered, which will result in his execution, do you think that you could actually take pen in hand and write in the answers, knowing that when you do that some day down the line the defendant here would actually be executed some day?

A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Okay. Mr. Richards, I've been over a lot of information. I think I've run out of questions, believe it or not. Do you have any areas you would like to talk about or anything else you think we should know about you?
  - A. No, I don't think so.
- Q. Okay. That's all the questions that I have, then. I'm sure the defense will have questions for you, but I appreciate your patience and your cooperation.
  - A. Okay.

THE COURT: Mr. Sanchez?

## **CROSS-EXAMINATION**

## BY MR. SANCHEZ:

Q. Mr. Richards, I know one of the persons that

you respected the most is Sparky Anderson. Is that Sparky or Spanky? I couldn't read that. Α. Sparky.

Did you meet him at the Rangers?

Yes.

0.

Α.

Q.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Baseball manager?

- Α. Yes. He was the stadium manager of the Tigers.
  - Ο. Were you a Tigers' fan?
- Α. No, not really. I just like the way that he conducted his team.
- Q. Okay. Followed his career? Went to the Reds and Tigers?
- When I was growing up we lived in Indianapolis and Louisville (phonetic) when I was in elementary school and they were the closest team and he was the manager. the Reds were my favorite team. So I just always followed him, not really the Tigers, just him.
  - 0. Okay. Is he a nice guy?
  - Α. Yeah.
- All right. Well, I also noticed in your questionnaire that you indicated that you knew police officers that were in your Sunday School classes?
  - Α. Yes.
  - Q. Who are they?

- A. Um, one is Larry Allen. He's with Dallas

  Police Department. I believe he's been there 10, 11 years.

  And another one is Chad Chadwick. He just started. He's

  stil'l in training with Highland Park. I guess they have a

  unique system where they are firemen, policemen, and

  paramedics, so I think he started about a year or so ago and

  he's still in training.
- Q. Is your only contact with them through the Sunday School?
- A. No, we're -- we're probably -- we're -- one of the three couples we hang out with are the Chadwicks. We do stuff on Fridays, go to Six Flags, ballgames.
  - O. Close friends?
  - A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Do you have children yourself?
- A. We do have children.
- Q. Your children are friends with their children?
- A. Yes.
- Q. You understand that in this case the State is alleging that an officer was killed by Mr. Murphy or the party to it. Would the fact that you have close relationships with those people who are police officers play into your decision --
  - A. No.
  - Q. -- in this case? Would it somehow be in the

back of your mind when you are listening to the evidence that you know these police officers that well?

A. No.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. If -- would you have a problem if the State can prove their case to you beyond a reasonable doubt and finding Mr. Murphy not guilty and not having to explain yourself to your close friends?
- A. I wouldn't have a problem with it, if the evidence warranted his verdict.
- Q. Okay. And since you know police officers that well, would the fact that a police officer comes in and testifies -- let me just back up. The law says that every witness that walks in that you listen to starts off at the same level of credibility. Okay? You can't give him any more points or less points based on what they do for a living. Okay?
  - A. I understand that.
- Q. That's before they testify. Of course, once they testify, you can decide, believe all or parts of what they have to say. Based on your close contact with somebody, two officers, is there any possibility that you would start off a police officer at a higher level of credibility before they have even opened --
  - A. No, I wouldn't.
  - Q. Also, when you first sat here and started

answering questions, you indicated that there was advocates out there who in a death penalty case, that life in prison or a life sentence would be somehow better and that you disagreed with that. Am I misquoting you when I say that?

- A. Say that -- you are saying that I disagreed with someone spending time, life imprisonment?
  - Q. Instead of the death penalty.
- A. I think that it's a case by case matter, warranted on the evidence, then that's the punishable crime.
- Q. You consider a life sentence to be -- is a severe punishment in a death penalty case?
  - A. I would say that it would be.
- Q. And you think or do you think that it would be appropriate in some cases, but probably not in all cases or how would you phrase that in a death penalty where the State is seeking the death penalty? Would you think that just because they seek the death penalty that the death penalty always has to be assessed?
  - A. No.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Now, when talking about parties and accomplices, also, you indicated that maybe as long as they make a pact that no one was going to get hurt and somebody kills somebody on their own that that can be in your mind a circumstance where the death penalty wouldn't be warranted; is that correct?

- A. That's what I said, yes.
- Q. Would you always need that pact before --
- A. No.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. So you would look at the case and --
- A. Look at the whole case, the merits, because, obviously, that would just be one -- be one part of the evidence.
- Q. So when we look over here at Special Issue No. 3 where it says including the circumstances of the offense, that might be something that you would look at and say on how to answer that Special Issue how it happened, the evidence of the case, what level of participation the person took?
- A. I think you would have to look at No. 3 in all cases.
- Q. Would that be something that you would consider yourself?
  - A. What --
- Q. The level of participation of the person in trial.
- A. Yes. I think I said before it just depends on the nature and the circumstances.
- Q. Now, at first it seemed when you sat down, you may not have been aware that this is one of the cases that's been titled the Texas Seven cases. Would that be right in

saying that?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. Yes.
- Q. And as we started talking, you realized that we were talking about one of those cases?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And I noticed in some of your answers you would say things that led me to believe that you already decided about how this all happened out there at the scene. I may be wrong, but have you -- you said something about they were all spread out in the store?
  - A. No. I was just citing that as an example.
- Q. It wasn't something that you decided already happened in this case?
  - A. No.
- Q. Now, we need twelve jurors on this case who haven't made up their mind as to what happened out there based on what they heard on the media or documentaries or newspaper articles or books that you have read. I mean, you know yourself better than I do. Is there some possibility that based on what you heard or have seen that you may have already made up your mind as to what happened in this case?
- A. I don't think so. I mean, obviously, I'm not going to lie to you. I've seen the media coverage on TV. I have been exposed to what they've said happened. But I haven't really read in depth anything in books or newspaper

articles, just what I saw on the news.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. So the exposure you have had is the 5:00 news and in the newspapers?
- A. The 10:00 news and the bold headline on the front page of the paper.
- Q. Does that exposure in any way taint the way you think the facts are going to play out?
- A. I don't think so. I'll be honest. I mean, other than what I've seen on the news, that's about all I know that happened on it. I never really followed that much.
- Q. Originally you said that you would reserve the death penalty for the actor and the accomplice may not in your mind, may not be the person to put to death.

  Originally when the State asked you that question, that was basically your answer; is that right?
  - A. That's when I -- what I said.
  - Q. And then your answer changed a little bit?
- A. No. I said -- I think I said that my answer changed, but it would be based on the circumstance.
  - Q. And it wouldn't --
  - A. -- of what happened.
- Q. And I'm just curious if it at all had any effect that you found out later on in the question that that was one of the Texas Seven cases, how that would -- somebody

being an accomplice may receive the death penalty in your mind where before you weren't that sure?

- A. No. I don't think I said before that. I said accomplices shouldn't be convicted on the death penalty. I think I said based on the circumstances, it would warrant an accomplice not being convicted. That's not what you thought I said. That was what I was meaning to say.
  - Q. That's why I was asking.

- A. I believe accomplices, they could be held accountable and receive the death penalty. It would just be the circumstances.
- Q. On Special Issue No. 2, one of the things that the jury is going to have to decide is whether the defendant actually caused the death of the deceased or not actually caused the death, but intended to kill the deceased or anticipated that a human life would be taken.

Now, I know the State kind of went over it, but you understand they have to prove Special Issue No. 2 beyond a reasonable doubt to the jury before you could answer yes to that question? Knowing that you found the defendant guilty at this point of capital murder and knowing that you have answered yes to Special Issue No. 1, would you still require the State to prove that to you beyond a reasonable doubt that the person anticipated that a human life would be taken? In other words, would you require them

to convince you beyond a reasonable doubt or would you already just answer yes to that question because you already answered the other ones?

In the way it's said, I think that's a very confusing question. But, in other words, would you require the State to prove Special Issue No. 2 to you beyond a reasonable doubt, first of all?

A. Yes.

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Okay. And would you require circumstantial evidence or hard evidence? I mean, there was a question as to whether you needed an agreement by the co-conspirators in order to answer that. What would you really need in order to answer that question or have it proved to you beyond a reasonable doubt?
  - A. For Special Issue No. 2?
  - O. Yes.
- A. I mean, for me to tell you, I don't know if I could right now. I mean, I would have to sit on the jury and hear the whole case. I think you are asking me, like, anticipate what I hear to give you an answer. I really couldn't.
- Q. But if you are on a jury, you know, found him, you know, guilty, obviously, you are finding him guilty on the evidence that was presented in the trial. Probably most of that evidence would be that Special Issue No. 2.

And another thing that you are going to, if you are on this jury, that you are going to encounter is you are going to take an oath, that oath that you are going to have to follow the law that the Court gives you and the law that applies in this case.

Sometimes people believe, well, you know, I'm on the jury and I'm going to do what I think is right regardless of what the law may say. In your questionnaire to the question, regardless of what the Judge says the law is, jurors should do what they believe is the right thing, and you had answered yes.

I don't know if you recall answering that and you explained that by saying, "If I believe that something is right, I'm going to go with my instincts." I want to explore that a little bit and ask you, are you going to do what you think is right as a juror, regardless of what the law says in answering these Special Issues because you think that's the right thing to do and it may not have been proven beyond a reasonable doubt or are you going to follow the law and hold the State to the burden that they should be held to?

- A. Could you read that again? I don't remember. It's been so long.
- Q. It's been a while since you filled this out.

  Once of questions was, "Do you agree with the following

statement"? And the statement was, "Regardless of what the Judge says the law is, the jury should do what they believe is the right thing." And you wrote, you checked the box that said yes. And you explained it by saying, "If I believe strongly that something is right, I'm going to go with my instincts."

And I just want to explore what you meant by that.

- A. And the question was about doing --
- Q. Basically, was some people think that or regardless of what the Judge says the law is, in other words, whatever the law is, jurors should do what they believe is the right thing to do.

- A. Okay. I must have misinterpreted that question. I mean, if I served on the jury and I took an oath, I would do everything based by the law and not my own personal, you know, feelings.
- Q. So when you said that you would go with your instincts, would they be limited by the law, your instincts, or still do what your instincts told you to do?
- A. No. I would obey what the law told me to do.

  I must have misread that. I mean, the way it looks, I don't know the way you are interpreting that question. It's like my mom got killed or something like that, if I just felt that he killed someone that I would just go with the death

penalty no matter what the Judge said. Is that how you are interpreting that?

- Q. No. I didn't know how to interpret that. That's the reason I wanted to ask you to explain that.
- A. I must have misinterpreted the question, because I wouldn't have just a personal vendetta. I mean, if the Judge said, you know, ignore that, I wouldn't say he said it. I'm going to stick to it. I wouldn't do that.
- Q. Usually where that comes into play is holding the State to their burden. Your sole job as a juror is to decide whether the State has proven their case beyond a reasonable doubt and that's your sole job. I mean, it's not going to get into, you know, moral questions and things like that. You are just judging their case. And sometimes people think, well, you know, I need to do the right thing, even though I'm not convinced beyond a reasonable doubt.

  I'm still going to do what I think is right. And by you doing that, you are lessening the burden on the State. And you are going to take an oath that you would hold them to it. You understand what I'm saying?
  - A. I understand what you are saying.
  - Q. That's why I'm asking that question.
  - A. Okay.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Now that I have explained it that way, would you be more concerned about doing what you thought was right

No. I would be more concerned with how the evidence was presented. And then after it was presented, would you still hold the State to their burden and make them prove their case beyond a reasonable doubt? Α. Yes. Ö. And make them prove those Special Issues? Α. Yes. 10 MR. SANCHEZ: I have nothing further, Your Honor. 11 12 THE COURT: Mr. Richards, if you would, please, sir, give us a few minutes and wait for us outside 13 and we'll have you back and let you know the final decision. 14 15 [Prospective juror out] 16 THE COURT: What says the State? 17 MR. SHOOK: We have no challenges for cause, Judge. 18 19 THE COURT: Defense? 20 MS. BUSBEE: We challenge the juror for 21 I think it's clear that he has predetermined the facts in this case and I would like to outline to the Court 22 some of the things that happened this afternoon that exhibit 23 24 that. 25 First of all, he had a strong opinion as

to whether or not an accomplice was death worthy and that was the opinion that he was not. And if he were to write such a law, he would not include those persons to those that were subject to the death penalty. Upon learning that this case as one of the Texas Seven, there was a change in his person. He flipflopped on that after learning of the Texas Seven.

He also told the Court under oath when he filled out his questionnaire that he had seen the documentaries or shows about the Texas Seven. He told us that before he knew this was a Texas Seven, after he found out it was a Texas Seven case, he backpedaled and denied that he had seen any shows, other than the news reports.

Furthermore, the questionnaire on page 9 asked the question very specifically as the Court is well aware, do you agree with the following statement, regardless of what a Judge said the law is, the juror should do what they believe is right and he checked yes. And I don't think that there's any question that he understood what he was being asked, because his answer is, if I believe strongly that something is right, I'm going to go with my instincts, indicating that his moral code of conduct would be stronger than the Court's instructions.

Throughout his voir dire he has -- we see a complete turn around from the time he learned part of the

-- prior to the time he learned the nature of this case, and subsequent and some of his answers reflect a knowledge of the facts of this case that he has denied under oath.

And I think it's clear from the totality of his questionnaire and his interview here today that he has formed an opinion and that he does have a bias and I would ask the Court to grant my challenge for cause on juror No. 499, Mr. Richards.

MR. SHOOK: In response, Judge, I think when we were talking about what he had seen on the Texas Seven, he said that he had seen news reports and I might have misread what he said about the documentaries. I think that was just on the others. I don't think that he was trying to say he saw those documentaries. But regardless of that, threw "under the law" out there about could you put it aside and decide the case on the facts, he was clear on his answers.

So I don't think that he was disqualified on publicity. And I think he's qualified under the law in all other areas.

THE COURT: Court finds that when Mr. Richards was explaining the law and had an opportunity to explain his answers he provided on the questionnaire, on further reflection he had acknowledged to the Court that he understands the law. The Court finds this juror to be

qualified. Would you like a minute to step in your office? (Recess) THE COURT: What says the State? MR. SHOOK: State accepts the juror. MS. BUSBEE: Defense will exercise a strike. THE COURT: Ask Mr. Richards to come back in. 10 [Prospective juror in] 11 THE COURT: Mr. Richards, thank you for 12 your service and time to this Court. And I know at this 13 point you will be disappointed, but you are not going to be 14 15 sitting on this case. It's one of those things that people don't want to serve on the jury, but you go through the 16 process. You kind of do. So I thank you again for the 17 parties, but you will not serve as a juror on this case. 18 [Prospective juror out] 19 THE COURT: Mr. Hamman. 20 21 [Prospective juror in] THE COURT: Good afternoon, sir. 22 How are you? 23 24 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good. THE COURT: Your name is Glenn Scott 25

Hamman?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Hamman.

THE COURT: Sorry for the wait. We don't know if we'll speak to someone for ten minutes, an hour, or two hours, so we have three people in the afternoon and whoever gets here first goes first. So I appreciate your patience with us, but it's one of those things with scheduling. I have to make one person wait or ten people wait.

I appreciate you coming down. Obviously, you had time to review the guide that I provided for you. It's a lot of law to be given to someone and we don't expect you to understand it from front to back. The lawyers will speak to you on certain issues of the law. My job is to be sure that you understand the law and then can you follow it?

Only thing the lawyers are interested in is your truthful opinions and there are no wrong answers. So this is the only time that you get to interact with the lawyers and the Court on a case like this. Some people think it's somewhat intimidating because you are the focus of attention. Sometimes people think they are on trial and they are not. It's just the only way that we can really have a good opportunity to visit with you and be sure you understand what is involved in this case.

Only question I have for you, the trial

date for this case shall begin on November 10th. Will you have any problems serving the Court with those two weeks?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't believe so.

THE COURT: Very well. With that,

Mr. Wirskye?

# GLENN HAMMAN,

having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

## BY MR. WIRSKYE:

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Mr. Hamman, how are you?

I don't know of anything right now.

- A. Good.
- Q. My name is Bill Wirskye. I'm the Assistant DA who will have a chance to visit with you for the next few minutes. And what I would like to do is touch on some of the information in your questionnaire and talk a little bit about your thoughts on the death penalty and capital punishment and talk a little bit about the laws that apply, if you are selected to be a juror in this case.

Going through your questionnaire, on the very last page we asked your thoughts about what you thought about being chosen as a juror in this case. I think you said you were a little bit uneasy?

A. Yes.

- Q. What did you mean by that?
- A. Well, what was the exact question on that?
- Q. I know it's unfair. You filled it out in May.
- A. It's hard to remember.
- Q. We're all sitting here looking at it and you haven't thought about it. How would you feel about being chosen as a juror in this case? And your answer was "uneasy."
- A. I guess being -- it seems like I remember that I guess it was some mention of the case in there as to what it was or -- and I just kind of -- I guess I, being on a death penalty case, I never have sat on one of those before, so --
  - Q. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. So I would be a little bit uneasy on doing something like that.
- Q. Particularly, just being on a different type of case or death penalty case in particular?
- A. Yeah, probably just the death penalty-type case.
- Q. You have been a juror before on just a regular straight murder case; is that right?
  - A. Right.
  - Q. How long ago was that?
  - A. Oh, that was probably -- seems like at least a

couple of years ago.

- Q. Okay.
- A. I can't remember the exact date on that.
- Q. Late '90's or --
- A. Yeah, maybe two or three years ago, somewhere around in there.
  - Q. Okay. Was it down in this building?
  - A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Okay. What do you remember about that case, the facts or --
- A. It was a case that was in -- Lancaster High School kids like at a party and I think some people from Ferris had come down and kind of busted up that party and I guess there was probably some drinking and marijuana and things like that being used. And the guy was surrounded by some people and I think a fight broke out and he had a gun with him and he started shooting, hit somebody, killed them.
- Q. Based on what you recall, was the evidence pretty straightforward?
- A. Yeah, it was fairly confusing, because there was some people involved as witnesses, I mean, they had, I think, about of a murder it's probably somebody is going to do something like that, that they would like to not have any witnesses around, but in this case here it was a party, so there were probably 50 witnesses. So everybody had a

different story and it was kind of hard to put everything together on something like that.

- Q. Looks like y'all ended up finding the person charged guilty of murder?
  - A. Yeah.
  - Q. And I think 75 years, was that the sentence?
  - A. Right.
- Q. Did you hear any additional evidence in the punishment or the second part of the trial?
  - A. Um --

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. That you remember?
- A. I don't recall. I don't recall that right offhand.
- Q. Okay. And you told us, I guess, generally, you are in favor of having the death penalty available as a punishment in some cases. And I guess the case you served on was just, again, what we call a straight murder case or regular murder case.
  - A. Right.
- Q. You know, in Texas you may or may not be aware that only a certain subset of murder cases qualify to actually be prosecuted as capital murders, actually qualify, where the State can come in and seek death. Just in your own words, what do you think? Why do you think we should have the death penalty available in our society as a

punishment? What value do you think it serves?

A. Um, I guess that if you didn't have the death penalty, then I feel it would probably be a little easier for people to kill someone and, you know, it's somewhat of a deterrent. Somebody really wants to kill somebody, I don't think anything would stop them doing that.

O. Sure.

- A. Whether it's short of the death penalty or not. But I think you have to have that because there is a gray line there where somebody might not commit a murder. They might think twice about it instead of doing it, if they know they might die for it, so --
- Q. In Texas, generally, I think you can think of capital murder as an intentional killing or intentional murder plus something else.
  - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. You shoot and kill a police officer, murder a police officer in the course of their duty, a fireman, a child under six, or if you commit a murder in the course of committing another felony like robbery or burglary or rape, that type of thing. Those type cases are the only ones that would be eligible for the death penalty. And I can pull out a gun right now and shoot Mr. Shook because I don't like his tie ten times in the head in the courtroom in front of everybody and that would not be eligible for the death

penalty.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

What do you think about that? I mean, if you were king of Texas or Governor for a day, would you kind of expand the list of eligible cases or are you happy where it is or shrink it or --

- A. Yeah, I mean, something like that, I guess, if it's an outright murder, something like you just got through describing, then I would warrant that being worth the death penalty on something like that, I mean. If you kill -- if you kill somebody and you intentionally do that, then I think it's warranted for the death penalty.
- Q. Okay. So I guess just any intentional murder, premeditated or bad facts, that type of thing?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. But you realize the law that we have now, the Legislature has given us, it's a more limited or narrow set of facts?
  - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. Do you know the murder case that you sat on, was there only one person charged in that crime? Do you remember more than one person with a gun or --
- A. Let's see. I think it was -- I think it was just one person --
  - Q. Okay.
  - A. -- that was charged, because I believe -- I

think he's the one that had the gun.

Q. Okay. The reason I asked that is oftentimes, especially in a situation like this where we're talking about a capital murder case, I think most people tend to think off the top of their head about the one guy going in a 7-Eleven, maybe, and shooting and killing the clerk during the course of a robbery. But as you probably know and can imagine, oftentimes crimes are committed by groups or gangs of people and sometimes you have only got, I guess, one person pulling the trigger, but you have other people involved in the crime.

And the law in Texas actually allows us to prosecute those nontriggermen for capital murder, the people that were active participants, but didn't actually pull the trigger and depending on the circumstances, the nontriggermen would actually receive the death penalty.

And I'm going to ask you how you feel with that. Because we talk to a lot of people and some people, you know, would completely take the death penalty off the table as an option for somebody that doesn't pull the trigger. I wonder what your thoughts are in that type scenario?

A. Well, I think if -- if you are -- if you are in a group that something like that happened and you don't know who actually did it and you're part of that group and

you made a choice to be part of that group, then you would have to be -- have the death penalty, you know. Whether or not you were the shooter, who would really know? And, you know, they could be pushed back and forth between that group and the pointing could start and say, I didn't do it, he did it. And that kind of stuff like that. Well, you made a bad choice of being with that group and have something like that happen, so I think that group ends up being one in a case like that.

Q. Acting as one?

- A. Acting as one.
- Q. We get that a lot, acting in concert. So you wouldn't necessarily take the option of a death penalty off the table for someone who didn't pull the trigger; is that right?
  - A. That's right.
- Q. I'll give you a quick example. Say, Mr. Shook and I decide we'll get together and rob a bank. And, you know, he's got the gun and we know each other. I know how mean he is and may have been to prison before. And we go in to do the bank robbery. He's got the gun. He's holding it on the teller. And I come in and I'm collecting the money.

And at some point something goes wrong and he shoots and kills that teller and, obviously, he's the triggerman. He could be prosecuted for capital murder and

ultimately, depending on what happens at the trial, receive the death penalty. But depending on my exact role in the offense, maybe whether I had a gun or how actively I was involved, that type of thing, I could also be found guilty of capital murder and ultimately receive the death penalty. What do you think about that type of scenario?

- A. Well, I think in a case like that, that it's, you know, you are part of that group and, you know, it's unfortunate that something like that might happen, but you still had a choice and you are going in there with an intent to commit some kind of a crime. And in your instance there, talking about a bank robbery, well, there could be somebody else in there with a gun that might try to stop the robbery or something like that. And before you go in you probably know that somehow that there -- somebody could get hurt.

  And so, there again, you made a bad choice of going in that bank, trying to rob it.
- Q. And we talk to a lot of people and they tell us that sometimes if we had gotten together and said, hey, no matter what happens, we're going to do what we need to do to get out of here.
  - A. Yeah.

Q. We are not going to leave any witnesses, that type thing. That sounds like the type stuff that might be important to you in deciding whether I should ultimately

receive the death penalty; is that right?

A. Right.

Q. Let me ask you this. You know, again, we talk to a lot of people down here. We realize this isn't everyone's cup of tea when you are talking about a capital murder case where you know actually somebody could get the death penalty, a person you are in the same room with like Mr. Murphy, sits here today, a life, breathing person.

And we talk to a lot of people who, I guess, philosophically or in the abstract are in favor of the death penalty. But, you know, probably be coming fast, it's one thing to be philosophically for it and be for it in the abstract and it may be another thing for some people to actually participate in it. And neither side is here to force someone into something one way or the other if they are not completely comfortable with it. We don't want to make anybody do anything to violate their conscience.

And, you know, I just want to make sure before we start and go any further that you feel that you are the type person that could make those decisions in a capital murder case and, for lack of a better word, are comfortable in participating in a trial like this. How do you feel about that?

A. Well, as I stated on my last question there, I wouldn't really feel, you know, that comfortable doing

something like that. It's not an everyday occurrence for me to do something like that. But, I know how society is supposed to work and if that ends up being the case where somebody has broken the rules and that it leads to the highest type punishment, then, you know, it's something that I would have to do. But although I might not feel that good about doing something like that, but, you know, I guess I could probably do that.

Q. Okay. You know, in Texas we don't ask a jury to kind of make -- we don't give them one question and say should the defendant get the death penalty or should he get a life sentence? What we ask them to do, and you probably read it in the handout, is -- the questions are up on the wall -- to answer a series of questions. And we let the answers to those questions determine the appropriate sentence. If the questions are answered yes, he's a future danger; yes, he caused the death or anticipated the death; and, no, there's nothing mitigating about the crime or his background or character, then under that situation the Judge would have no discretion and the death sentence would be imposed.

So I just want to make sure that you are comfortable, you are the type of person that could take pen in hand and answer those questions such that you know it may result in the death of a human being. Again, I know it's

not easy or comfortable for anyone, but I want to make sure you are the person that can answer those type questions.

A. Yeah, that --

- Q. We're going to talk about the questions a little more in detail, but I want to make sure that you are okay before we go any further.
  - A. Yeah, yeah, I think I could do that.
- Q. Okay. Fair enough. And as you may remember from your trial, trials in Texas are divided into two parts. The first part of the trial is, basically, the guilt/innocence part where it's just mainly focused on the facts of the trial. It would be up to a jury to decide whether the person is guilty of capital murder or not. You know, did the State prove their case beyond a reasonable doubt?

And if the person is found guilty, then you move into that second phase of the trial, which would be the punishment phase. The rules of evidence would be a little bit broader. You would get to hear different information, good things about his past, bad things about his past, if they are -- their prior criminal history, that type of thing. We try to bring you a little bit more information so you can answer these questions and make that decision and that's, basically, how the trial works at that point. Does that kind of make sense to you?

- A. Uh-huh.
- Q. That's our law in Texas. And, you know, we just want to make sure you are the type of person that feels they can live with that and follow the law that the Judge gave you; is that right?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. All right. Let's look at Special Issue No. 1 up here on the board. They are called Special Issues. I like to call them questions. Question No. 1. And realize before we even answer these questions, you would have found the person guilty of capital murder. Okay?
  - A. Okay.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. And then we go in --
- A. This is the punishment.
- Q. -- the second phase, the punishment phase, that is assuming that you found him guilty.

Basically what the law is, is, you know, nothing that you do in that first part of the trial, the guilt phase, automatically answers any of the questions in the second phase. The law requires the jury, a juror, to start in the second phase with an open mind and look at the evidence again and answer these questions in good conscience. Does that make sense to you?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. No -- none of these questions are

answered automatically.

- A. Uh-huh.
- Q. Things like that, the first question, basically, asks whether there's a probability that the defendant would commit acts of violence that would constitute a continuing threat to society. Basically, is he going to be a future danger? That type of thing.

Do you see kind of how that question asks you to make a prediction about future behavior?

A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Okay. Is that something that you feel like you would be comfortable with, looking at the type of crime and maybe looking at his background and making somewhat of a prediction about future behavior?
- A. Yeah. I think, you know, after hearing enough evidence and I guess he would end up having some psychologists and things like that in there and kind of getting the case history of somebody is kind of profiling somebody, I could make a decision based on that information.
- Q. Okay. That's the type of evidence that would be important to you?
  - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. Okay. You know, that question is pretty straightforward, unlike a lot of things we do. Do you know here when you see that word "probability", what does that

mean to you?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. That there's a pretty good chance of something being positive and there's always that other chance of something being on the negative. But I think of a probability of being on the higher side of something.
- Q. Okay. Basically what it is, certainly doesn't have a certainty or high probability. Maybe more likely than not. Does that make sense to you?
- A. Yeah. I mean, if you had the word "high" in there, then it would mean one thing. But just the word "probability" is a little lower scale than the higher probability, the way I look at it.
- Q. And then it talks about commit criminal acts of violence just as you read that "criminal acts of violence", I'm curious how you would interpret that.
- A. Well, I would say any kind of -- as we talked about earlier, like robbing a bank or any kind of robbery or bodily harm to someone else or something like that.
  - Q. What about threats? That type of thing?
- A. Yeah, that would kind of be on a little bit lower scale, but threats, I think that would be probably one of the things I read in there where somebody threatens somebody's life and it's -- I can't remember if that was -- would be part of aggravated --
  - Q. Robbery?

- A. -- robbery or something like that with a threat, with some kind of bodily injury whether it's with a weapon or not. But --
  - Q. Sure.
  - A. But bodily injury threat.
- Q. I wanted to make sure that you understand the law doesn't require us to prove that another murder is going to be committed or aggravated robbery or rape. It's just any act that you would consider a criminal act of violence. Does that make sense to you?
  - A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. And finally the question talks about that very last word "society." Constitute that continuing threat to society. And I'm just curious how you would define "society" when you think about that word.
- A. Um, I guess society is -- it's pretty general.

  It's kind of -- I think of society as just the entire population of people.
- Q. That's pretty much what people tell us.

  Anyone that he might come into contact with, is that kind of what I'm hearing you say?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. If it's out here in the free world with us or behind bars. Does that make sense to you?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. Other prisoners, guards, that type of thing?
- A. Uh-huh.
- Q. Okay. One thing to remember about these questions, question 1 and question 2 are alike in the sense that we have the burden of proof. We have to prove it to you as a juror beyond a reasonable doubt that the answer should be yes. Kind of a default setting on those first two questions is no and it's up to us to prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt that the answer should be yes. Does that make sense to you?
  - A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. You had mentioned, you know, that you think maybe some psychiatrists or psychologists, that type of thing, may be helpful for you in answering No. 1?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. What -- explain that to me again.
- A. Well, if we wanted to talk about backgrounds, you know, if you were saying that we would have more information on that punishment phase and find out if somebody had a kind of a record in the past or their past history, character witnesses coming up and talking about what had happened in the past, and I assume that probably at some point in the trial there would be some kind of psychologist or psychiatric-type evaluation based in there. So based on things like that, then you would know a little

more about that person to be able to make an educated --

- Q. Decision?
- A. Pardon?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Make an educated decision?
- A. Yes, that's --
- Q. Is that something that you feel like you would want to hear from a psychiatrist or psychologist to answer that?
- A. It wouldn't have to be, just be from other people, other people that maybe he has worked with and been associated with for years and high school friends or things like that. It doesn't have to just be from a professional person. But I would like to take everything there and put it all together and try to sum up my own opinion based on that information.
- Q. You wouldn't necessarily require that either side bring you a psychiatrist or psychologist?
- A. No. If there's not one present, it's just character-type witnesses, then that might end up being enough.
- Q. Let's move on to question No. 2. This is whether the defendant actually caused the death, whether he's the triggerman. Of course, if he's the triggerman, that question is pretty easy. Or if he didn't actually cause the death of the person, if he intended to kill the

person, like a hitman or murder for hire, or he anticipated that a human life would be taken. This is the question that kind of covers that nontriggerman scenario.

And I want to be honest with you and lay all our cards out on the table. This is a case where we're prosecuting Mr. Murphy under that theory of accomplice, the nontriggerman, and that's the theory we're proceeding under in this case. And, again, I want to make sure that you are comfortable sitting on a case where the State is seeking the death penalty for an accomplice or a nontriggerman.

- A. Uh-huh. Yeah, like I said before, if you know -- if you are part of a group and something like that happens, then it's unfortunate that you are part of that group, but I guess the answer is yes to your question on that.
- Q. Okay. Kind of going back to our example of me and Mr. Shook, you know, if he goes in with that gun and I say, hey, the teller is trying to get away, shoot her.

  Obviously, I'm not the triggerman. But I certainly had been an active participant and I could be found guilty of capital murder. Or if I just should have anticipated that a life may be taken, because I know he's mean, I know he has a loaded gun, that type of thing.
  - A. Uh-huh.

Q. Then I could be convicted of capital murder.

In order to receive the death penalty in Special Issue No. 2, the bar is raised just a little bit from the standard of should have anticipated to actually did anticipate. They would have to prove or the State is going to have to prove in my case that I actually anticipated a life would be taken, that type of thing. Does that make sense to you?

A. Yes.

Q. And, again, question No. 1, that starts off with a default setting of no and it's the burden of proof on the State for us to prove to the jury beyond a reasonable doubt that the answer to that question should be yes. Does that make sense to you?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Let's talk about Special Issue No. 3. That's a little bit different from the first questions, but neither side has the burden of proof. In that question -- okay, it's just up to you as the jury to answer that and that's basically, I guess, a safety net or a safety valve. That's kind of the last stop in the process, kind of ask a juror to step back, take a deep breath, and looking at everything they have seen and see if there's anything there that is mitigating, anything that would lessen his personal moral blameworthiness. And if there is something like that, is it sufficient that his life should be spared? Does that make sense to you?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. We talked to a lot of people and, you know, realize before we even get to Special Issue No. 3, you found the person guilty of capital murder. You have decided they are going to be a future danger to society. You have decided they either pulled the trigger or they anticipated a life would be taken. You know, you decide all that before you get to Special Issue No. 3.

Some people tell us, you know, very frankly, by the time I've gotten that far in the process, my mind is closed. I don't care what the law is, you know, there's just not going to be anything mitigating. My mind is closed to it.

So I want to make sure that you kind of understand about that last stop in the process and that you can tell us truthfully that actually if you got to Special Issue No. 3, that your mind would be open to that. What do you think about that?

A. Um, you know, I guess the way I see that is just, you know, maybe a back door to get out. But like you were saying, if the first there -- if you go through the question 1 and 2, it seems to me the way those questions are set up there is that you have pretty much made up your mind at that point in time that someone like that would be a menace to society and that they did act with an intent to do

some kind of a crime there.

So I think that at that stage there, I don't know -- I mean, I don't know if that No. 3 would apply to the way I'm thinking on something like that.

- Q. Uh-huh. What the law, basically, says is the law doesn't necessarily tell you what is mitigating. You can think something is mitigating and another juror would think it's not mitigating, it's aggravating. All you need to tell us in order to be a qualified juror is, hey, going into Special Issue No. 3, even though I have made these other decisions, I can still keep an open mind. And if there's something there that I consider sufficiently mitigating, I can keep an open mind and deny imposing the death penalty and give a life sentence. Does that make sense to you?
  - A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. That's the law. Is that something that you think you would be able to follow?
- A. Um, yeah, I guess I could -- it would probably have to be something -- something big come up if I've already made that decision based on those top two.
- Q. I know it's not something you sit around thinking about.
- A. I mean, it would have to be something big that would really sway my mind to change my thought process from

that to do that. I know some people might end up needing that back door to get out because they might end up thinking what have I gotten myself into or something like that. I don't really want to do this. That's the back door to do that.

But I think for me that once I got through the 1 and the 2, trying to keep up with the way the laws are stated and the way your questions are stated, that I don't -- it would just have to be something big to change my mind.

Q. We always ask people and no one sits around thinking about this stuff and I hope you don't, unless you are a lawyer like us. But we ask a lot of people, you know, anything off the top of your head that you would consider mitigating and almost to a person no one can come up with anything. So it's not unusual and we can't require you to come up with things. Sometimes people say, well, if the person was real young, that might be mitigating. Other people would say, no, you are old enough to know right from wrong.

Some people may tell us, you know, if they were abused or had a bad childhood, that may be mitigating. Other people would say, again, life is choices and you can overcome a bad upbringing. So we don't require you to make a decision one way or tell us today what you

would consider mitigating. We just need for you to be able to tell us you can keep an open mind.

You know, basically what it boils down to is this is the final check, the final safety valve, the final stop, in the process. And can you honestly tell us that you could keep an open mind and that you actually see value to having, you know, that Special Issue No. 3 and, you know, your mind isn't closed by the time you get there?

A. Uh-huh. Yeah, I guess I could keep an open mind in doing that, if that's, you know, it would be -- it would be pretty small at that stage, but I guess like a one-percent-type open mind there once I got to that stage of it after answering these other questions and finding somebody guilty of that.

1,2

Q. You know, like I said, we talk to people that say, no, Mr. Wirskye, my mind is just closed. That question has no meaning for me, has no value. I don't see the purpose, utility, in it. But I want to make sure you see the value in it and that you can tell us you could keep an open mind. You don't know what it is. You know, you may listen to 99 or 100 death penalty cases and never hear something that is mitigating. As long as you can keep that open mind, go into it and see some value in it, you would be a qualified juror and you will be able to follow the law.

Do you think that's something that you can do?

- A. Like I said, it's a one at that stage of the game right there. It's a one-percent-type open mind.

  There's --
- Q. What a lot of people tell us is, it's been in the news a little bit, mental retardation. You know, if I heard evidence that somebody is severely or mentally retarded, to me that might be mitigating. That type of thing.
  - A. Uh-huh.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. And a lot of people tell us that that's been on the news a lot lately in capital punishment and stuff.

  Do you think that you could keep that open mind?
- A. I guess in a situation like that, I don't know if it would, the way I feel about murder. No matter who does it, you know, somebody is taking another life and it might be hard for me to change my mind at that stage of the game.
  - Q. Okay.
- A. I mean, if my mind was going to change, it might be somewhere in the trial process that would affect the 1 and the 2. But once I've got to that stage of the game, it would be kind of hard for me to change my mind.
- Q. We kind of touched on this earlier. That's kind of the scheme that we have that the Legislature has given us. You don't make a choice between the death penalty

and life. We ask you to use your, I guess, mental discipline and work the process that we have if you find him guilty of capital murder, find that doesn't automatically answer -- you know, because you found him guilty, doesn't answer No. 1 automatically, doesn't answer No. 2 automatically. By the same token, because you found him guilty and maybe answer No. 1 yes and No. 2 yes, it doesn't automatically answer No. 3 for you no?

A. Uh-huh.

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. I mean, that's what we're looking for. Can you really use that mental discipline? You don't have to think of an example right now. You just have to tell us you have an open mind and you can follow the law and that you at least see some value in having that question. You know, I don't know what it would be. We can't predict those things. But, you know, it's kind of --
- A. I can see having that third question as a value for certain people because everybody has different thoughts and everybody works through life in different manners. So I can see having that third question available for people.
  - Q. Okay.
- A. It's just that third question is a small percentage for me at that stage of the game.
  - Q. That's fair enough as long as you tell us you

have an open mind.

- A. Okay.
- Q. You can follow the law in that respect?
- A. Yes.
- Q. I'll stop beating a dead horse. Are you ready to move along?
  - A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. But the point is each one of those questions you look at independently. Nothing is automatic. You make a fresh, independent inquiry to each question. You can use everything that you heard to help you answer it. You just can't answer these things automatically. Does that make sense to you?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And that seems like the law and you can follow it and that type of thing?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Let's talk a little bit about, you know, you have been on a murder trial before, but some of the different types of witnesses that you may hear. You touched on it yourself earlier. Oftentimes in these types of cases, death penalty cases, either side would call psychiatrists, may call a psychologist to testify.

Just generally, how do you feel about that? Would you -- you know, a lot of people think that,

you know, they are very valuable. Some people have no value to them. Some people are kind of in the middle and say, you know, gee, I'll just have to listen and see what they have to say. Where do you kind of put yourself?

A. Well, I would probably put myself in the middle on that. Just because somebody is, say, has -- that's their profession in doing that, I wouldn't -- I wouldn't just totally, you know, be in awe of them and whatever they said would make me change my mind on something. It depends on the entire case.

So they are just part of that case and just leading to one more piece of evidence to go on. So that's why I put myself in the middle.

- Q. That's what the law says. You start over with each witness out on the same level, psychiatrist or psychologist or police officer, you can't give a police officer an automatic leg up because they are wearing a badge and a gun. Obviously, there is a case where we allege a police officer has been killed. You have some tie to law enforcement. You said your sister works in the FBI?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. Who does she work for or what division?
- A. I'm not sure who she actually works for, but they are in the Dallas Division. They were downtown. I think they moved to that office out on Northwest Highway.

- Q. The new big office building?
- A. Yeah.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Anything about having somebody close to you that works for the FBI make it difficult for you to be completely fair and impartial in this case?
- A. Um, I guess I've got a nephew that's going through the police academy now, so -- and that's in Garland, Garland Police Academy. And so my sister, she actually is on the staff there. She's not an agent out in the field.
- Q. Anything about that that would make it difficult for you to be completely fair to our side or Mr. Murphy?
- A. Um, I guess I would, having people on the police force and the -- I would probably, I guess if I had to sway to one side or the other, I would probably be swayed more towards the police side of it.
- Q. Would you be able to follow the law and start the police witness on that same level?
  - A. Yeah, I think I could probably do that.
- Q. Okay. And the other bottom line question, I guess, regardless of your ties to law enforcement, do you think that you could decide the case just on the evidence you hear in the courtroom? Do you think that you can do that?
  - A. Based on --

- Q. Just the evidence you hear in the courtroom, not any feelings or emotions that you may have for somebody else in law enforcement?
- A. Would that be based on anything -- I mean, I know things about this case.
- Q. And that's the last -- the Judge has given me I don't have much time left. But let me cover that one last area with you. On a case like this that's a high profile case, everybody we talk to has heard about the case. And we're never going to get a jury of people that don't know a thing about this case. And it's okay as a possible juror to have heard about the case. You may have even formed some opinions somewhere along the line.

What the law basically requires is, again, you know, regardless of what you heard, you don't necessarily have to put it out of your mind. You just have to be able to tell us that I can base my decision on the facts and the evidence that I hear in the courtroom. Okay? You would probably agree with me that would be the best source of information.

I don't know if you are like me.

Sometimes I'm a little skeptical about what I read or hear on the TV. But do you think that you could, regardless of what you heard or read about this case, just decide this case based on the facts and the evidence that you hear in

the courtroom?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. Yeah. I guess in all honesty on that, you know, I do know about the case because I remember it being on TV and I read about the case.
  - Q. Sure.
- A. And that being, you know, something like this happening to a police officer, you know, I do have feelings about that and --
- Q. Do you think that you can put all that aside and just base your verdict just on what you hear in the courtroom?
- A. Yeah, I would like to think that I can do that and do my societal job on something like that, but I do have some mixed feelings just based on what I've read and what has happened to where that might be a little harder for me to do.
- Q. I understand it may be tough. Because to tell you not to think about something you already know is kind of unnatural and not very within our human nature. But, actually, it works for both sides because, you know, what you may have heard or read you never know whether it's correct.
- In order to be fair to both sides, you have to concentrate and base your decision on what you hear in the courtroom and it's kind of one of those questions I'm going

to have to pin you down on a yes or no answer. May be hard, maybe not. But do you think that you can do it, just make that decision based on what you hear in the courtroom?

- A. And it has got to be a yes or no --
- Q. Pretty much. That will be the last question I ask you. I guarantee you.
- A. I guess if I have got to go with a yes or no on that, you know, to being -- I guess I would have to say yes on that. Like I said, it's still a little difficult, but I would like to think that I can do that.
- Q. Okay. So you can make your decision just based on what you heard in the courtroom, right?

10

11

12

13

14

. 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. I'm trying to -- that's a tough one.
- Q. You have already answered yes, right?
- A. Yes, with a qualification, right.
- Q. It's a yes or no question. If I don't ask you, they are going to ask you and the Judge is going to ask you.
- A. In this particular case it's, you know, I've still got to qualify that it would be hard based on the evidence that is presented in the courtroom. I would like to think that I can try to do that, but I do know what happened. And, you know, so I guess I can say yes on it, if you have got to have an answer. It's a little bit over the line yes, but I'll say that.

Q. I think that's where I'm going to quit,
Mr. Hamman. Thanks for your time.

MR. WIRSKYE: I will pass the juror.

THE COURT: Ms. Busbee?

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

## BY MS. BUSBEE:

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Okay, Mr. Hamman. I'm going to let you tell me how you really feel. You are the kind of juror that we love to have down here because it doesn't seem like you are trying to hide anything.

Here's what happens. Sometimes when we talk to jurors, by the time you have made it to where you are right now, you have already been culled out. You don't know how many times some of the strange things that people say on their questionnaires and the opinions and whatnot and, you know, we kind of agree on who we are going to talk to.

So from your questionnaire you,

obviously, appear to be middle of the road, that somebody -
that both sides may find a juror. You know, it's hard to do

this. And the reason that it's hard to do it is it's such

an extreme penalty. Nothing hits harder to home than

causing the death of someone else. It has to do with why

we're here and it has to do with what the outcome will be.

So I'm pretty sure -- and after talking

to you or listening to you talk to Mr. Wirskye, I'm quite certain that you can follow the law. And I'm quite certain that you are going to tell us the truth. What I don't want you'to do is think that there's something wrong with your opinions. It's taken -- well, let's see. You may or may not know that at one point the death penalty in Texas was found unconstitutional and because it was kind of -- it was a formless question once someone had been found guilty of capital murder, there were no guidelines for jurors to tell them what they had to do to determine constitutionally to assess a death penalty. You know, so some communities it was almost a lynch mob mentality and it wasn't fairly administered.

I think it was 1976 when they drafted the first death -- new death penalty statutes. So it's a work in progress in some respects. Once in a while you will read something in the newspaper that the Supreme Court has either broadened it or narrowed it. It's a work in progress, which means if you have an opinion that is different than our scheme here, it wouldn't be surprising. In fact, I think most people would feel that way. They either think it should be stronger or they think it should be less strong.

So the thing is -- and you saw how many people we brought down that morning. We brought down -- we

brought that many again in the afternoon. So we expect to talk to a lot of people. And there's nothing wrong with not, you know, getting on this jury. The only wrong thing would be if we got a false impression of your feelings based on just asking if you could follow the law. I just want to know how you feel, because it's okay. I don't think that anybody necessarily that I know agrees with every law. It's not like we're asking you to break the law. We're just asking you to tell us your personal feelings because nobody wants to put you in a position to violate your own moral code, so to speak, one way or the other.

So do you know -- you said that you were uneasy and you had a hesitation. And I kind of see this here because you caught up to the scheme faster than anybody else who has been sitting in your chair. We've only been doing this two days, but you pretty much honed in on your feelings about this one.

Is he going to be dangerous in the future? You would like some evidence on that, whatever that might be. And was he part of a gang that anticipated or planned to take a human life, would be things that would have been proved to you beyond a reasonable doubt. And it's not a more if I say maybe, maybe not. It's to be proved to you beyond a reasonable doubt. And if it was proved to you beyond a reasonable doubt, you would have said yes to those

first two questions.

I think I'm hearing from you that No. 3 might be a good thing for people who were uncomfortable with assessing the death penalty, but that as a real matter in the real world, there really isn't anything else that you would need to know to be able to change your mind about giving the death penalty.

A. Well, I think that some people, they might mean well or they might be bold enough to go that route with 1 and 2 and then at some point in time they might recheck themselves and say, man, what have I done? I don't -- I got mixed in with the group or I got caught up in the subject of it all and I didn't really mean to go that far. You know how some people -- well, some people in a group they will do things they might not do individually. But the group gives the adrenalin flow or something and somebody will end up doing something.

And so that's what I'm saying. That is my thoughts about that is that you have something in there where somebody can step out at the last minute, if they don't feel -- if they feel like they have gotten caught up in something and they do want to back out, that might be the back door to get them out of that for their own moral conscience.

Q. Right. I think that's what -- but you don't

need Special Issue No. 3 in your mind?

A. In my mind, if I've gone the route of the 1 and the 2 and I've found that somebody has murdered somebody beyond a reasonable doubt, then, yeah, that's just the way I feel about the laws. If we become too lenient, then, then I think more people would end up doing that, if it was just a life. If we didn't have the death penalty, it was just life in prison, then there's -- because I know -- well, I guess from reading and hearing things on the news, I don't know firsthand that people, they might have a better life in prison or might be the same type of life. It's a life that I'm not used to. I don't really know anything about. But I know it exists that there's life on the streets that goes on just like life in a prison.

And so somebody might end up feeling like they are better off or just as well off in prison. At least they are getting fed every day and they have some place to stay and perhaps it -- perhaps it is less violent because it's a little more structured, feel better in there. So they might end up committing a crime and murdering somebody, knowing they are not going to have to die for it. And they -- maybe they don't intentionally mean to, I guess, premeditate going out and killing somebody, but they might rob somebody for some money and kill them and not think anything of it because, hey, it's just going to be life in

prison.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Okay. I get your point. So the way you see the scheme, you don't need and don't really consider Special Issue No. 3 to be necessary to you?
- A. No. Once I get to the 1 and the 2, if I'm satisfied in my mind with those two and then like we were saying, this is after the fact we found somebody guilty and now we've heard other character witnesses and other testimony and then we've gone back into the jury room to decide that, then I don't think that I would need the No. 3 personally.
  - Q. Okay.
  - A. I see why it's there.
  - Q. For other people?
  - A. For other people.
- Q. So, quite frankly, and I think that you told us this five times, but for the record, if Special Issues
  No. 1 and 2 have been answered by you yes beyond a
  reasonable doubt, you wouldn't say yes that he should live?
- A. Well, right. Because if that's the way the law -- I mean, if that's the way the case is set up and that's how he's been prosecuted, then I wouldn't -- I wouldn't have the 3 in there. I mean, my feelings would end up being that somebody would deserve the death penalty at that stage.

- Q. Okay. So, question 3 just isn't for you, just 1 and 2 and at that point you say it's been proved to me beyond a reasonable doubt and any of the other issues are immaterial?
  - A. What do you mean by immaterial?
- Q. I found he's going to be a future danger, I found he did this intentionally, he knew it was going to happen or expected it to happen, that's all. These are the questions that you need to answer in order to assess a death penalty?
  - A. Uh-huh.

- Q. And the other question is for people who have some trepidation about assessing the death penalty?
- A. Well, you know, and like I said, somebody might get caught up into that and they might go through and they might have voted guilty and then they are coming in and answering 1 and 2 and they are looking at that and saying, yeah, that's good. I go with that. I go with the No. 2. But then at some point in time they might get cold feet. And so that No. 3 would leave them an out, according to the rules and the procedures going through there that answer 1 and 2. And if you really can answer those yes at that stage of the game, you still might have cold feet and don't want to do that, you have changed your mind, so to speak, even though it's that late date, so the No. 3 does allow somebody

with the moral conscience to get out. I assume that's put in there so somebody has gone that far and they decide they wanted out, then that might bother them for the rest of their life that they actually had to put somebody to death and so they're thinking about that so that allows them to say, no, I don't answer that question yes.

- Q. Okay. But you, yourself, do not consider -- would not consider that as a backdoor way to get out once you have decided issue 1 and 2?
  - A. Yeah, for me personally.

- Q. I think I got your true opinion out on that and I have beat a dead horse, too.
  - A. That's a hard one to answer a yes or no on.
- Q. I know that I spend a lot of time in the courtroom and sometimes I, for various reasons, have to get on the witness stand so I'm used to being in here and I know it's a very nervous, you know, you get anxious and it's hard to concentrate once you first sit up there. So no matter how cool you are in your normal course of business, it's just an anxiety producing experience to be faced by a bunch of lawyers and drilled.

But you have been real frank with me and I appreciate it. And I'm not going to take up the time I have, but I was wondering, too, since you've been so candid, you said this several times when you were talking to

Mr. Wirskye about your knowledge of this case and then when asked if you could set it aside, I think it would be fair to say that you seemed to indicate that you would try and answer it yes, but you were really having some difficulty with that.

know, I can't promise you that I can set it aside or I swear that I can set it aside, but you need to err on the side of overcautiousness as far as fairness of the process goes.

And, you know, there are people who may not tell us the truth and say they can. But I think that you have been telling us the truth. And I'm going to ask you to err on the side of cautiousness and tell us if you really can't set that aside or if you, quite frankly, you know what happened and you have already kind of made up your mind what happened.

- A. Well, can I tell you what I do know about the case?
  - Q. Well, sure.

A. And I guess this is why, you know, I do have an opinion. I mean -- and I know that the -- we watched it on TV as it took place and it was interesting and this was on that "America's Most Wanted" and things of that nature. And, you know, I've read about the people involved in the case. And I know that in the robbery of the Oshman's, I

think it was that, you know, the policeman was shot about 20, 25 times and run over.

So -- that would be, you know, knowing that information, that would be hard for me to consider that No. 3.

- Q. Okay. Well, I'm really not talking about No.

  3 anymore. I'm talking about if you already have an opinion about guilt/innocence in this case.
- A. You know, based on what I do know about that, you know, I guess I would probably have to say that I do have an opinion on that as being somebody mixed in with a group like that and having something like that happen, being a police officer it might -- the evidence would have to really be super strong for me to change my thoughts.
- Q. So, in essence, we would have to prove to you that it hadn't happened or it hadn't happened as you think it did before you could change that opinion?
- A. Yeah. My thoughts there would end up being that that whole group, that whole group of people, wouldn't have to be there.
  - Q. Okay.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A. I mean, I see that group of people being there and, like I said earlier, I think of a group of people as one. And so that whole group of people wouldn't -- if they weren't at the scene and that was proven beyond a reasonable

- Q. So you would have to hear from us something different than what you have already heard in order -- well, that's one of those questions that makes sense to me, but probably didn't make sense to someone else. You know what happened and I'm guessing that you are saying that you really do know what happened and you can't promise us to a certainty that you can set that aside if you sat on this particular case?
- A. Yeah. Knowing what happened, how it happened, and, you know, just the degree of what happened, then that would be hard for me to. Like I said earlier, it might be something I would try to put aside, just as a duty.
  - Q. Sure.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. But it would be hard to just blank my mind of that.
- Q. And you can't guarantee that? I'm hearing that in your voice?
- A. Yeah. I don't know if I could guarantee that I can blank my mind and start totally fresh without, like I didn't know anything had happened.
  - Q. Okay. Listen, I appreciate your candor.

    MS. BUSBEE: Approach the bench?

THE COURT: Parties agree?

MR. SHOOK: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Hamman, as she said, we appreciate your honesty. You have indicated that you know a whole lot about this case and also the Special Issue No. 3. The parties have agreed this is not your case. So we're going to excuse you from jury service and you are free to go. Thank you for coming down.

[Prospective juror out]

[End of Volume]

STATE OF TEXAS

COUNTY OF DALLAS

I, NANCY BREWER, Official Court Reporter for the 283rd Judicial District Court, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing constitutes a true and correct transcription of all portions of evidence and other proceedings requested in writing by counsel for the parties to be included in this volume of the Reporter's Record, in the above-styled and numbered cause, all of which occurred in open court or in chambers and were reported by me.

WITNESS MY OFFICIAL HAND on this the day of

NANCY BREWER, CSR, NO. 5759
Expiration Date: 12-31-04
Official Reporter, 283rd JDC
Frank Crowley Crts. Bldg. LB33
133 No. Industrial Blvd.
Dallas, TX 75207
(214)653-5863

REPORTER'S RECORD

74851

# VOLUME 9 OF VOLUMES

TRIAL COURT CAUSE NO. F01-00328-T

STATE OF TEXAS \* IN THE DISTRICT COURT

VS. \* DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS

PATRICK HENRY MURPHY, JR. \* 283RD DISTRICT COURT

\*\*\*\*\*\*

INDIVIDUAL VOIR DIRE

COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

MAR 9 - 20C4

Troy C. Bennett, Jr., Clerk

On the 3rd day of September, 2003, the following proceedings came on to be heard in the above-entitled and numbered cause before the Honorable Vickers L. Cunningham, Sr., Judge Presiding, held in Dallas, Dallas County, Texas.

Proceedings reported by machine shorthand.

ORIGINAL

25

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

### APPEARANCES

### APPEARING FOR THE STATE

Mr. Toby Shook
SBOT NO. 18293250
And
Mr. Bill Wirskye
SBOT NO. 00788696
Assistant District Attorneys
133 No. Industrial Blvd.
Dallas, Texas 75207
Phone: 214/653-3600

# APPEARING FOR THE DEFENDANT

Ms. Brook Busbee Attorney at Law SBOT: 03488000 703 McKinney Ave. Ste. 312 Dallas, TX 75202 214/754-9090

Mr. Juan Sanchez Attorney at Law SBOT: 00791599 5630 Yale Blvd. Dallas, TX 75206 214/365-0700

17 18

19

10

12

13

14

15

16

20

21 22

23

24

2,5

1	PRO	OSPECTIVE J	JUROR INDEX		
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR	CRT.	STATE	DEFENSE	VOL.
3	Phillip Emery	4	6	42	9
4	Erica Hefner	64	66		9
5	Marty Ingle	76	80	114	9
6	Frankie Freeland	124	126		9
7	Susanne Krupihnski	136	138		9
8	Dona Garrett	147	148		9
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
L5		<del>*</del>			
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22			-		
23		*			
24					
25					
				<b>-</b> -	

# PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: Ready for Mr. Emery.

[Prospective juror in]

THE COURT: Good morning, sir. How are

you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm great. Thank

you.

THE COURT: Is your name Phillip Wayne

Emery?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Emery.

Thank you for being here. You brought your guide. Did you have an opportunity to read that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

of you and trying to digest in a very short period of time.

Please understand that you don't have to be able to integrate all that law and understand it from front to back right now. The lawyers are going to visit with you and try to explain it to where you can understand it. And my job is to be sure that you, A, understand the law --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.

THE COURT: -- and, B, can you follow the law? If you don't understand their questions, just say,

Judge, can you explain it to me, if they get you confused,

and then I'll try to do my best to explain it to you. With that, the only question that I have for you, sir, is will you be able to serve this Court for two weeks, beginning November 10th? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: THE COURT: Any questions? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: One, yes. In reading this when I first came down and filled out the survey, I forget the date I was here --10 THE COURT: Back in May. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It was for Patrick 11 Murphy and this is saying somebody else. This is saying --12 and maybe it's just an example, but I don't think it is. 13 This is saying for Randy Ethan Halprin. 14 THE COURT: You must have an old one. 15 Good reading. I have corrected those. If you should read 16 it was a different template, it is for Mr. Murphy. 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay. 18 19 THE COURT: Good question. We'll figure 20 that out, thank you. Mr. Wirskye, would you like to inquire? 21 MR. WIRSKYE: Yes. 23 PHILLIP EMERY, having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as 24 follows: 25

#### **DIRECT EXAMINATION**

# BY MR. WIRSKYE:

Q. My name is Bill Wirskye. I'm going to be the Assistant DA to spend a few minutes visiting with you this morning. We appreciate you showing up early and being on time so we can get started.

What do you think about all this now that you have been called back down for the individual interview?

- A. Well, it's a little -- I've never been involved in anything like this, so it's kind of overwhelming.
- Q. We apologize kind of for the setup. In a normal nondeath penalty or noncapital case we talk to the jurors as a group. But since this is a case where we're seeking the death penalty, we get to talk to you individually. Kind of the best way to do it is put you on the witness stand. I know it's a little uncomfortable, but to the extent possible I hope you will try to be comfortable.

There's no right or wrong answer. Both sides really are trying to figure out how you feel about some issues and if you think you are the right type person to be on a case like this. I'll talk to you a little bit about some of the things in your questionnaire, a little bit about the death penalty, and then maybe, finally, a little

bit about the law that you have read that may apply in this case.

You told us you are generally in favor of the death penalty; is that correct?

- A. Uh-huh.
- Q. What do you think the -- or why should we have it as a society, the death penalty, in your view?
- A. Well, I just was brought up in church and I've always believed in an eye for an eye. You are not supposed to take somebody else's life and I just have always been taught and feel and I believe that if you take somebody's life, your life should be taken, also.
- Q. Okay. So that's something you have believed in most of your adult life it sounds like?
  - A. Uh-huh.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Are there any particular cases that come to mind, maybe cases you read or heard about or particular type of set of facts or something that when you think about the death penalty you think, gee, that's an appropriate case for the death penalty?
- A. I really can't think of one that comes to mind per se, no.
- Q. No case that you followed in the media or anything like that?
  - A. Not really, not for the death penalty, I

guess.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Okay. Just off the top of your head, do you think that you might be the type person that could participate in a process like this? I know it's not for everyone, but --
  - A. Well, honestly, I would rather not.
  - Q. Most people wouldn't. I understand.
- A. But, you know, if I'm chosen and have to do it, I'm sure I can do it.
  - Q. Okay. Great. What type of work are you in?
  - A. I'm in sales.
  - Q. Okay. What product or line?
- A. Plantation Shutters, so it's a lot of new home construction, visiting with new home owners about all their window coverings in their house.
  - Q. Do you travel or pretty much in town?
  - A. Pretty much Metroplex here, yeah.
- Q. Your wife works in some kind of security; is that right?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. What does she do?
- A. She's a private security officer for Tenant
  Health Corporation, so she does a lot of traveling and she's
  responsible for the security, the privacy security, of all
  the patients for all the hospitals that Tenant Corporation

owns. The health records and things like that? Α. Yeah. It's not a situation where she carries a weapon or --Α. No. Q. Wears a badge? She probably wears a badge, but she Α. doesn't carry any weapons. Q. Okay. You also told us in your free time you 10 like to fish? 11 Uh-huh. Α. 12 Q. What type of fishing do you do? 13 Α. Mostly trout fishing is what I was brought up 14 fishing for, but it's learning to, you know, how to catch 15 bass and catch fish. 16 17 Q. I'm a bass fishing, large mouth? Α. That's the best kind of fishing. 18 Q. I don't get the chance to go as much as I 19 would like. My boat is full of cats and spiders. 20 A. Yeah. 21 We talked a little bit about the death penalty Q. 22 and you told us generally you are in favor of it. 23 run, I guess, a fact scenario by you and get your thoughts 24 on it.

You know, oftentimes crimes are not just committed by one person. I think when you think about the death penalty in Texas or, you know, like murder in the course of a robbery, you think about one person going in with a gun, maybe holding up a 7-Eleven and shooting the clerk and committing a capital murder. But oftentimes they are committed by gangs or groups of people, that type thing.

The law allows us, depending on the facts and circumstances, not only to prosecute, I guess, for lack of a better word, the triggerman for the death penalty, but also depending on the facts and circumstances to prosecute a nontriggerman, somebody that doesn't actually pull the trigger in the case, prosecute them for capital murder and ultimately maybe even receive the death penalty.

And there are some people who are in favor of the death penalty, such as yourself, who, you know, really are comfortable with that being the law and there's another group of people that just say, you know, if I was king for a day or Governor for a day, in my state and my world that the option of the death penalty would never be available for that nontriggerman. Only the person that actually pulled the trigger should be subject to the death penalty, not the nontriggerman. What do you think about that?

A. That's a real gray area, I have to admit. I

would not have a problem sentencing somebody to a death penalty if they were the trigger person, obviously. A nontrigger person, depending on the situation and that sort of thing, you know, I don't know. It's a tough question. If they were just in the wrong place at the wrong time, I would have a problem convicting somebody of the death penalty.

Q. Sure.

- A. Somebody may have just lost their head and lost their cool and killed somebody and everybody else was just like what are you doing, you know. Then I don't know if that person would be worthy of the death penalty.
- Q. Okay. Let me give you this fact scenario and see if it kind of crystallizes or helps think through this. Let's say Mr. Shook and I decide we're going to rob a bank. We've both been to prison before and I know he's a violent guy. The plan is for him to take the gun in and hold up the bank teller, the bank clerk, while I go in without the gun maybe and I'm supposed to collect the money, that type thing.

As we go in and do that, I see the clerk reaching for the silent alarm and I tell Mr. Shook, hey, she's reaching for the silent alarm. He shoots and kills the clerk. Obviously, he's the triggerman. He's committed capital murder. The law also allows, you know, probably in

that set of facts and circumstances for me to be prosecuted for capital murder and, depending on the answers to the Special Issues that you looked at, maybe receive the death penalty. What do you think about that type of scenario?

- A. Oh, that seems a little more clearcut. You were definitely involved and participated one hundred percent in the death of that clerk. So, yeah, I wouldn't have a problem there.
- Q. You can keep an open mind for the death penalty for the nontriggerman in that scenario?
  - A. Uh-huh.

Q. That's basically what the law is. Obviously, if it's the wrong place at the wrong time, somebody that wasn't connected in any way, of course, they wouldn't be guilty of anything.

You know, sometimes it's called the law of accomplices. If I help Mr. Shook, if I aid, encourage, solicit, or direct him to commit a capital murder, then it's just as guilty legally of capital murder and depending on the answers to the questions, I could receive the death penalty. Or if you believe we agree to commit this bank robbery, under my example, and in the course of that robbery Mr. Shook commits that murder in furtherance of the bank robbery, even though I didn't have the intent for someone to die, I could be found guilty of capital murder and

ultimately receive the death penalty, depending on what the jury thinks. Does that make sense to you?

A. Yeah.

- Q. Okay. So I just want to make sure you are not one of those people that would completely take the death penalty off the table in any situation for a nonshooter.

  Doesn't sound like you are.
  - A. No, I wouldn't.
- Q. Okay. Under that fact scenario, what do you think would be important to look at for the nontriggerman?

  What types of facts would you want to know or what would you be interested in knowing about the crime?
- A. Well, as much information as I could get.

  Obviously, I think his background would mean a lot, you know, if he had a violent background and had been known to do it more than once, that kind of stuff. And all the involvement that he had, you know. In the case you just gave me there was quite a bit of involvement and quite a bit of facts backing that up and that would all be very important to me.
- Q. Okay. Fair enough. We talk to a lot of people in these cases and almost everybody we talk to in this particular case, I think, has heard something about this case, pretty much heard something, TV, radio, that type of thing.

The law is that just because you have heard something about the case, you are not necessarily disqualified from being a juror. All the law requires is that potential jurors base their verdict just on the evidence they hear in the courtroom. You know, it doesn't ask you to forget what you have heard or anything like that. It just asks you to base your verdict on what you hear in the courtroom.

And you, like everybody we've talked to, indicated they had heard something about this case. What do you remember hearing about it?

- A. Well, more than anything, just the Texas 7 was a big term. And the fact that they ended up being caught in Colorado Springs and I'm from Colorado and lived there my whole life. So that was kind of an interesting event in Colorado.
  - Q. Trout fishing?
  - A. Exactly.
  - Q. You don't learn that in Texas.
  - A. No.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Okay.
- A. Understand it's just a real coincidence and didn't mean anything. But the last time I had jury duty was the day they were bringing the first Texas 7 to Dallas in the big convoy and I just happened to go to lunch break and

I got out of the -- from my lunch break and all the cameras were here and all the news stations, so I got to see the convoy come in while I was here. And just little things like that. And it was interesting to see them on TV and see their faces.

But as far as all the facts go and stuff, I really don't have all the facts. What you see on the 6:00 news is what I know, what I heard.

- Q. But the actual details of anything, sounds like you are still pretty much in the dark about them?
  - A. I am, I really am.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. So it doesn't sound like it would be that big of an issue for you if you were a juror to just base your verdict on what you hear in the courtroom?
  - A. No, wouldn't be an issue.
- Q. So you can put anything you have seen or heard out of your mind?
  - A. I think so, yes.
- Q. Have you had a chance to follow any of the other trials in this case?
  - A. No, sir.
- Q. Okay. Fair enough. Like I said, we talk to a lot of people and we really, we don't want to jam anybody up or put anybody in a bad spot. But I can tell you, you know, it's our position at this table and just to be up front with

you, we are prosecuting Mr. Murphy under that law of accomplices as a nontriggerman.

But I want to be up front with you. This table thinks, you know, we have the type and quality of evidence that's going to cause a jury to find him guilty of capital murder and answer those Special Issues in such a way that he will actually receive the death penalty.

And I know it's one thing to kind of talk in the abstract or philosophically about being in favor or supporting the death penalty, but I know sometimes for some people it's quite another thing to come down here and actually see a living, breathing human being and maybe be asked to participate in a process that ultimately would end up, you know, with him being executed down in Huntsville, to not put too fine a point on it, but actually lying dead on a gurney in Huntsville.

In Texas the death penalty is a reality. We do carry it out in this state. If he receives the death penalty some day he would be executed. I want to make sure that's something that you are comfortable with -- or maybe that's not a good word, but you are at least okay with going ahead with this process and potentially being a juror?

A. Yeah. I think so. I have given a lot of thought. Never -- if somebody were to ask you, I've never been involved in a situation like that and to answer the

questionnaire back in May, it was eye-opener and then, since then, I've given it a lot of thought. And up to that point I never have -- you have never been put in that situation, you don't really go to those extremes. And it would be difficult.

Yeah, it would be difficult, but at the same time you have to take all the -- I have to take all the facts and, you know, if the law says this and all the facts point to the person being involved was guilty of those facts, then I can do it.

Q. Okay. And as you may know now from looking at the law for a few minutes, we don't ask a jury to vote yes or no on the death penalty. If a person is convicted of capital murder, you know, we ask a jury to look at three different questions and depending on how the jury answers those questions, determines whether the person receives that life sentence or they receive the death penalty.

So, again, I just want to make sure that you feel you are the type person that could take pen in hand and answer those three questions in such a way that it may result in the death of a human being and sounds like you are okay with that. It's not easy or not anything that you would enjoy.

A. Yeah.

Q. But you could do your duty, if you were called

on?

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Okay. And, again, just a little bit of background. Capital murder in Texas is always a murder, an intentional murder, plus something else. If you murder a fireman or policeman on duty, a child under six, you could be subject to the death penalty. If you commit an intentional murder during the course of another felony like robbery or something like that, you could be subject to the death penalty.

A lot of people come down here and think maybe any murder case would have the possibility of the death penalty and that's just not true. I could turn and murder Mr. Shook right now because I don't like the tie he has on, and do it in the most violent way and laugh about it and I may have been to the penitentiary five different times, but that would not be subject to the death penalty.

- A. I didn't know that.
- Q. We actually reserve just a certain subset of murder cases for capital murder. And in this case we have alleged the murder of a police officer on duty and, also, an intentional murder during the course of a robbery. And if we prove either one of those to a jury beyond a reasonable doubt, the law would entitle us to a guilty finding, that the jury find the defendant guilty of capital murder. And

that's, basically, the first part of the trial where you just kind of focus on the facts of the crime itself.

If that person is found guilty of capital murder, then you move into the second phase of trial which we call the punishment phase of trial. And that's where the jury answers those three Special Issues. At that point the rules of evidence broaden out a little bit. You may get to hear information about the person's background and character, good, bad, that type thing, prior history, prior crimes, if they exist, in order to help you as a jury answer those three questions.

And, again, one way to look at it is, if a person is convicted of capital murder, they are kind of sitting on a life sentence at that point. If the three questions are answered in such a way yes, yes, and no, then at that point and only then would they receive the death penalty.

So it's really kind of a two-phase process. Does that make sense to you?

- A. Yes. Of the three questions, do they all three have to be yes or two of the three?
- Q. Do you have them in front of you? Flip to them.
  - A. Uh-huh.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. We usually have the big exhibit, but we don't

have it this morning. It would be Special Issues No. 1, 2, and 3.

A. Yeah.

- Q. Take a second and run through those and, again, I think you told us they had a different person's name in it. But if you just read over that, take just a minute to read over that.
  - A. Okay. [Prospective juror complies.] Okay.
- Q. Those are the three. They are called Special Issues. I just refer to them as questions that need to be answered in a case such as this. They weren't drafted just for this case. The Legislature drafted them and they apply to all capital murder cases.

One thing to realize when you get into that punishment phase, the law asks the jurors to go back and look at each of these three Special Issues and kind of make an independent inquiry, okay, into each question to really exercise mental discipline and work through each question.

What the law doesn't want or doesn't envision is somebody who answers anything automatically. Sometimes we have people that come in here and say, if I found him guilty of capital murder in the first phase, that's automatically going to answer one of those three questions for me. And that's what the law doesn't want.

We want jurors that can keep that open mind, use that mental discipline, be fair, and work through the facts they heard in the first part and the facts they heard in the second part and come to the right answer on these. Does that make sense to you?

A. Yes, sir.

- Q. Okay. And if you will look at Special Issue
  No. 1, you know, you will see, you know, is there a
  probability the defendant would commit criminal acts of
  violence that would constitute a continuing threat to
  society? As you can see, we have the burden of proof on
  that. It's just like the first phase, the guilt. It's up
  to the State to prove to you as a juror that the answer
  should be yes, that they are going to be a future danger to
  society. So that question kind of starts off with a no
  answer. That's kind of a default setting. We have to prove
  to you beyond a reasonable doubt the probability that he
  would commit these future acts of criminal violence. Does
  that make sense to you?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And you can see it's basically asking the jurors to make a prediction on future events based on what they heard about the crime in the first phase and any other evidence they may have heard in the second phase.

Is that something that you think you can

be comfortable with, making that sort of prediction, if you had some evidence or information in front of you?

- A. Well, I don't know about comfortable, but --
- Q. Again, that's probably a bad word for anything in this process, but is it something that you feel that you can do?
  - A. Yeah, I mean, yeah.
- Q. Okay. A lot of words in that question are not defined. The law kind of leaves it up to the jury. It's kind of a common sense, really, question with some common sense words. But when you see that word "probability", what does that mean to you?
- A. Well, probability, the likelihood or the chance.
- Q. That's pretty much exactly what the law says, more likely than not, maybe 51 percent. It doesn't say a high probability or anything like that. Just more likely than not. Does that make sense to you?
  - A. Uh-huh.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. It talks about the "criminal acts of violence." Again, that phrase is not defined. Criminal acts of violence. Is there anything that comes to you off the top of your head that you think about when you hear that phrase? I know this is something you probably never thought about.

- A. Well, I mean, if I hear the term "criminal acts of violence", it's somebody violently breaking the law.
- Q. Okay. Again, the law leaves that definition up to you. I just like to point out that the law doesn't require us to prove to you as a potential juror that he's going to be responsible for taking another life or commit another murder or another capital murder, that type of thing. Does that make sense to you?
  - A. Yes, sir.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. It could be robberies, threats, assaults, that type of thing. Also, the very last word in that question talks about society. And the law doesn't really put a limit on that word "society". I'm kind of curious how you would define that or what kind of definition would you give it?
  - A. The world I live in.
  - Q. Okay.
  - A. My neighborhood.
  - Q. Okay. How about the world behind bars?
  - A. Say that again? I'm sorry.
- Q. The world behind bars, prison. Again, the law doesn't necessarily limit that word "society." And I'm just curious, I guess, when you look at it you would define it to include, you know, people behind bars, other prisoners, guards, teachers, doctors, that type of thing?
  - A. Oh, I misunderstood your question for a while

there.

- Q. It's early in the morning, so it's probably me.
- A. Yeah, it would go for anybody's space, you know, whether it's minor, whether it's who is ever around it, violent criminal.
- Q. Again, that's pretty much -- again, the law allows you to define it that way. It's a pretty straightforward question. We have to prove it to you beyond a reasonable doubt. Again, we do get some people who come down here and when we explain the law to them, they tell us, very frankly, Mr. Wirskye, when I get to that Special Issue No. 1, that first question, my mind is closed. If I have found somebody guilty of capital murder, whether they are the triggerman, nontriggerman, whatever, if I have found them guilty of capital murder, I'm always automatically going to answer that question No. 1 yes. I'm always going to feel that way. It's automatic. I know what the law requires. I just couldn't keep that open mind.

How do you feel about that? Do you think you could keep that open mind and again go back and make that independent inquiry to answer that question No. 1?

A. Well, really and honestly, if I found somebody guilty, the State proved to me without a reasonable doubt that that person was guilty of whatever act that we're

talking about, I would probably lean towards putting a yes for No. 1 automatically.

Q. It's okay to lean that way or be predisposed to what the answer is. What we can't have is people that do it automatically, that don't look at the evidence, and just say if I found him guilty of capital murder that fact and that fact alone is going to cause me to automatically answer that question yes.

I could sit here and give you hypotheticals all day long. You know, my neighbor sexually assaults my young daughter, okay? And I find out about it. I think about it for a few days. I go over there, kick down his door, committing burglary, shoot him because he's molested my daughter. I've committed a capital murder.

But a jury may find when they get to that Special Issue that I would never be a future danger because it was such an isolated event. It's out of character for me, that type of thing. So I could give you hypotheticals all day long.

And it's okay to lean that way or be predisposed. We just need you to say you could keep that open mind and you won't automatically answer the question that way.

Do you think that you could, you know, use that mental discipline and keep that open mind and give

an independent inquiry?

- A. Yes. After your hypothetical, that kind of defined it a little better.
- Q. Well, the bottom line is, you just don't know what's coming. We sit here now and ask you to keep an open mind and everyone conjures up those facts that are the worst facts imaginable and, gee, a capital murderer is probably going to always be a future danger.

But you just don't know what's coming in the case because you haven't heard the facts and evidence. And that's why at this point we ask you, the law will, can you keep an open mind? Sounds like that's something you can do. You wouldn't just answer that question automatically yes because you found him guilty of capital murder; is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Moving on to Special Issue No. 2. It's kind of like Special Issue No. 1. We have the burden of proof on it. It starts out with a no. We have to prove it to you a yes. It kind of deals with the situation we've already talked about whether a person actually pulled the trigger or doesn't actually pull the trigger.

You know, as you read this question, if the person actually caused the death of the deceased, that's easy. They are the triggerman. But if they didn't actually

cause the death, did they intend the deceased to be killed or did they actually anticipate that a human life would be taken? And that's kind of, you know, in order to find somebody guilty, going back to our scenario, if you find that I should have anticipated that Mr. Shook may have shot that teller, if I should have anticipated, you can find me guilty of capital murder.

When we get to the second phase of the trial, the law imposes a little bit higher burden and says, you know, before you can assess the death penalty you have got to find not only should I have anticipated that a life could be taken, but that I actually anticipated that a life would be taken, that type of thing. Does that make sense to you?

A. Yes, sir.

- Q. Okay. It's a little bit higher burden from the quilt.
  - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. It goes to that situation we talked about, the person that doesn't actually cause the death, the nontriggerman, which, you know, is how we're prosecuting this case. But, again, the law requires you to keep an open mind. You can't answer it automatically, even though you may have found he should have anticipated. You have to make that independent inquiry in the second phase of the trial

and see whether we have proven it to you beyond a reasonable doubt that they actually anticipated a life would be taken.

Does that make sense?

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And if we prove it to you, the answer would be yes.
  - A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Make sense?
- A. Uh-huh.
- Q. I want to make sure you see that difference between the should have in the first part and actually anticipate in the second.
  - A. Right.
- Q. And, again, you are not going to answer that question automatically just because you found somebody guilty of capital murder; is that right?
  - A. That's right.
- Q. Okay. Finally, Special Issue No. 3. This is kind of the last stop in the process. Kind of call it our safety net or safety valve. We call it the mitigation question. This is a little bit different than the first two questions because neither side has the burden of proof.

  It's just up to the jury to answer this question yes or no.

Basically, this question asks you to go back, look at the facts of the crime, look at the

defendant's character and background and his personal moral culpability, what blame he bears in the offense, and see if there's anything mitigating, anything that lessens his personal moral blameworthiness, and if you do find that there's something mitigating, is it sufficiently mitigating that his life ought to be spared, that he ought to get that life sentence instead of the death penalty. Does that make sense to you?

- A. Not really. Would you say that one more time?
- Q. Sure.

- A. I'm not sure what mitigating means.
- Q. You know, there's not necessarily a legal definition. I've seen it defined as something that lessens the defendant's moral culpability, his moral blameworthiness.
  - A. Okay.
- Q. You know, I'll give you a quick example. Say we go back to when I shoot Mr. Shook because of his tie. I may shoot him ten times and the jury would think that is aggravating. Okay? I may shoot him once because I don't like his tie and realizing, oh, my gosh, what have I done? I throw away the gun, try to give him CPR, call 911. The jury may find that mitigating. Yes, I committed the murder, but my actions afterwards were mitigating. It's opposite of aggravating, anything that lessens a person's moral

blameworthiness.

Some people think maybe the age of the person. You know, if somebody is 19, 20 years old, some jurors tell us, hey, that may be mitigating because they were young. Other jurors may think, gee, that's actually aggravating and it was at least not mitigating because they are old enough to know the difference between right and wrong.

- A. Yes, thank you.
- Q. Does that make sense?
- A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Again, we know this is nothing, hopefully, you have ever thought about in your life and we are throwing a lot out to you in a little bit. Is there anything off the top of your head that you think may be mitigating?
  - A. With the case?
  - Q. I'm sorry?
  - A. Can you repeat the question?
- Q. Is there anything off the top of your head that strikes you as maybe potentially mitigating when you think about a capital murder case? We talked about age. Some people talk about drug use, maybe mental retardation, things like that. Any of those kind of strike you?
- A. Well, yeah, I mean, I think every case would be isolated and you would have to take all the

circumstances. But, yeah, I think a handicap, a mental handicap, or a --

- Q. You know, we're not talking about somebody who is so retarded, I guess, they don't know the difference between right or wrong, but some mental handicap like you said. Does that make sense?
- A. Yes. I think I would have to take a few of those things into consideration.
- Q. And that's what the law asks you to do, basically, to look at those things and if you find something mitigating, is it sufficiently mitigating that his life ought to be spared, that type of thing?
  - A. I understand, yeah.

Q. The law doesn't define mitigating, necessarily, doesn't require that you consider any certain fact or factor mitigating. It just leaves it up to the jury. In fact, the jurors can disagree. One juror could think this is mitigating and another think, no, it's not.

So it's kind of up to you. And, again, it's that last stop, that last check in the system, that safety valve, asks you to take a deep breath, stand back, because you know at this point you have found him guilty of capital murder, you said he's going to be a future danger, you said he anticipated that a life would be taken, you have already made a lot of decisions, but at this point we want

you to stand back, take that deep breath, look at everything you have heard, look for mitigation, and see if it's there such that his life should be spared.

- A. I understand.
- Q. Keep that open mind. Again, we talk to some people that say, if I'm that far in the process, if I have already made those decisions, my mind is closed. There's never going to be anything mitigating at that point. And those people wouldn't be qualified to be a juror.

What I kind of hear you telling me is you could keep that open mind even when we get that far in the process; is that right?

A. Yes, sir.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Okay. Any questions about those Special Issues, those three questions, or how they work?
- A. No, no, sir. I think you have explained them pretty well.
- Q. Well, it will be the first time, if I have. So you have never been on a jury before; is that right?
  - A. No, sir.
- Q. Okay. Let me talk to you just a little bit about some basic laws that apply in any trial, not necessarily a death penalty case. But the law kind of requires that you start every witness out on the same level of credibility, you know, when they walk in this courtroom

and hit the witness stand. You can't necessarily give a witness a leg up because, say, he's a police officer, that type thing. You know, once they start testifying, you can find them credible or find them not credible, but you at least have to start them off on the same level. Does that make sense to you?

A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. You think that you can do that, you know, start a police officer off on the same level of credibility, that type of thing?
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Okay. And I ask that because, obviously, this is a case where we've alleged that a police officer has been killed. Your wife is in security. I know it's not the same as a police officer. I want to make sure that you can follow the law and start everybody out on the same level?
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Okay. A lot of times in these type of cases you may hear from a psychiatrist or psychologist or some sort of mental health professional may be called by either side to testify in that second phase of the trial. We talk to some people who say, you know, they are worthless. I wouldn't believe a word out of their mouth. I don't trust them. And we talk to kind of another set of people that just think they walk on water. Every word out of their

mouth is golden. And we talk to some people who say, you know, I'm just going to start them off with that same level of credibility and see where this goes. You know, if they make sense, I'll listen to them. If they don't, I won't.

Make sense to you?

A. Yes.

- Q. Do you kind of fall in the middle group of people?
- A. Yes. I'm a pretty good judge of character. If somebody is talking off the wall, I catch up with that. And if they are making sense and there's some important information that I find is important to the case, I will definitely listen to it.
- Q. We don't want people that will close their minds because they are listening to a psychiatrist and the psychologist. Sounds like you would keep an open mind to any type witness; is that right?
  - A. Yeah.
- Q. We've talked about the burden of proof. It's always on us. You know, the State, the DA's Office, has to prove his guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. We have to prove Special Issue 1 and Special Issue 2 beyond a reasonable doubt. This side right here, you know, they are fine lawyers. They probably will do something, but they don't have to. The burden is always on us. It never shifts to

them.

You probably heard about the presumption of innocence. As we sit here right now, legally the law presumes Mr. Murphy to be innocent. If we all quit right now and went home, he would be found innocent. Does that make sense to you?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And it's just another way of holding us to our burden of proof. If you look on the back page of that, you will see the indictment, I guess. Again, it's probably for the wrong case, but --
  - A. This is correct.
- Q. Okay. The indictment is correct. That's basically what we have to prove. We've alleged capital murder. As I have told you, we have alleged it's been committed two different ways, the murder of a police officer and the murder in the course of a robbery. That kind of breaks down into different elements that we have to prove.

We have to prove that a certain person on or about a certain date took the life of another certain person in a certain way. These are what we call elements of the crime. The law requires us to prove each and every element of the crime. You know, we can't go nine for ten or eight for ten. We don't get partial credit. And if we omit one of those elements, the jury can't help us out. If we

miss one, the law would require you to find the person not guilty. Does that make sense to you?

A. Yes.

Q. Just to give you kind of a far out example, one of the elements we have to prove is what county this happened in. Let's say we had a capital murder case in Grand Prairie where some of it is in Dallas County and some of it is in Tarrant county. The police don't do their homework, the DA's Office doesn't do their homework, and we allege in our indictment as an element of the crime that it happened in Dallas County.

And when we get down here to trial and you are on the jury and all the evidence shows it actually happened in Tarrant County, on that case we haven't proven one of our elements. A lot of people say, hey, it's a technicality. I don't like it. We would get fired if we were that negligent, basically.

It's kind of an extreme example, but under that example, whether you like it or not or think it's a technicality, you would be forced to find the defendant not guilty because we missed an element. We don't get partial credit. We can't go nine for ten or anything like that. Does that make sense to you?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Is that something that you think that you can

do, if you have to?

- A. I wouldn't like it, but, yes, I can do it. I would have to do it.
- Q. It's just our burden. If we allege that the death happened from a handgun, a shooting, and the evidence shows it's a knifing, a cutting, again, you would have to do it under the law. You may not like it, but it sounds like that's something that you would have that mental discipline to hold us to our burden of proof?
  - A. I would have to, right?
  - Q. Yeah, that would be the law.
  - A. Yeah.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Let me talk to you a little bit -- we talked to -- kind of once a person is convicted of capital murder, they are kind of sitting on that life sentence and only if the questions are answered in such a way, do they get the death penalty. If you serve as a juror, you will find out that a life sentence in a capital murder case means forty years, day for day, forty calendar or forty hard years before the person becomes eligible for parole. Doesn't mean they are entitled to it, doesn't mean they are going to get it, but that's forty years before they see a parole board.

The law tells you that and then tells us you can't consider that, okay, that you have to treat a life sentence as actually meaning a life sentence, because they

may never make parole. They may actually serve a life sentence.

And the reason for that is this. We've talked about how we want jurors to keep that open mind and really work through the questions. We don't want jurors to think, you know, forty years, that's just not long enough. I don't want to take that chance, so I'm going to give him the death penalty because he could parole out after forty years. Or we don't want jurors to say forty years, that's a long time. That's enough. I'm not going to bother with the questions. I'm going to give him a life sentence. Make sense to you?

A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. That's why we do it. Again, we require jurors to presume that life means life. Does that make sense to you?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Would you do that if you were called upon to follow that law?
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Okay. Also, sometimes we try cases like this. You may have a choice of in that first part of the trial to find someone, say, guilty of capital murder or find somebody guilty of a lesser offense like aggravated robbery or find somebody not guilty. They are called lesser included

offenses, basically.

Let's say that you found that the death didn't happen, okay? We have alleged murder in the course of a robbery. The evidence shows that no one died at that point. The law would require you to find the person guilty of the lesser included offense of aggravated robbery. Does that make sense?

- A. Well, yes, except that would be one of the areas that you were -- it would be a technicality, right?
  - Q. We wouldn't have proven what we alleged.
  - A. Right.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. We could still prove a crime, a lesser crime, like aggravated robbery.
  - A. Okay.
- Q. Does that make sense to you? Or say we allege -- well, does that make sense? It may or may not come up in any case. We just have to talk about it in an abundance of caution.
  - A. Let's talk about it one more time.
- Q. I'm sorry. Say we try an aggravated or capital murder case where we've alleged a murder happened during the course of a robbery. Okay?
  - A. Okay.
- Q. And the evidence shows that the murder really didn't happen. A robbery happened, but a murder didn't.

Okay? So at that point you would find the defendant guilty -- or not guilty of capital murder because no murder happened. But you would find him guilty of a lesser of aggravated robbery.

A. That makes sense.

Q. In some cases you may have that option. So aggravated robbery would be a lesser included offense of capital murder, that lesser offense, because we don't know whether it will come up or not in this case. We still have to deal with it. It may come up, may not.

But in order to be a qualified juror, again, you would have to be able to tell us that if I did find somebody guilty of aggravated robbery, I could keep a full mind to the entire range of punishment for the aggravated robbery. The range of punishment for aggravated robbery is anywhere from five years in the penitentiary all the way up to life. Okay?

And, again, the law says -- we don't want you prejudging them. If you do find somebody guilty of aggravated robbery, you would listen to the punishment case and make an appropriate decision. But you haven't closed out the low end of punishment and you haven't closed out the high end. You can keep the open mind to the entire range of punishment. Make sense to you?

A. Yes.

- Q. Five to life, is that something that you think you can do?
  - A. Yes, sir.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Okay. We have run through a lot. Do you have any questions for me, Mr. Emery?
- A. Well, I don't really think I do. I was just here to answer questions. And if I'm chosen to be on the jury, I'm sure I will find out -- I'm sure my questions will be answered, any that come up. I really don't have any right now.
- Q. It's a little unfair. We bring you down here, we haven't explained any law to you, and get you to fill this out and haul you back down here and tell you all the law. And, you know, we know that you didn't know the law when you filled this out. So in a sense it's kind of unfair to ask you questions about it.

And we recognize individuals can feel any way they want about a particular law. They can like it, they can not like it, but the bottom line always is can you follow the law, can you be fair, and keep that open mind and follow the law? And it sounds like that's something that you could do, if you have to?

- A. I believe I could.
- Q. Okay. Mr. Emery, I appreciate your time. Thank you.

MR. WIRSKYE: That's all I have, Judge.

THE COURT: Ms. Busbee?

## **CROSS-EXAMINATION**

## BY MS. BUSBEE:

Q. Well, Mr. Emery, just like Mr. Wirskye said, it does seem unfair that we ask you about how you feel about things and then tell you what our law is. But we feel like if we tell people what the law is before we ask them questions, they'll tailor their answers to the law.

Because I know you saw how many people were there the morning that you came down. I think it was in the neighborhood of 2,500 people. Some of those people by their questionnaires -- a lot of those people by their questionnaires, were unqualified based on some of their answers, so we didn't even discuss them. We got together, the State and defense, and we went through questionnaires and we weeded out most of them, a small percentage of the folks that actually come down here to talk to us, real small percentage, of that huge group of people that we saw there that morning and I think that now you are getting a picture of why.

A lot of people are for the death penalty, but most people think of the death penalty in their mind as, we'll find him guilty of the capital murder and then the death penalty will follow. But that's not actually

how it has evolved. I mean, did you read the paper this morning?

A. No, ma'am, I didn't.

Q. Well, this is what's happened over the years. The Courts have said, it's not fair, it's not constitutional, whatever kind of roof they hang that on, it's not right to give someone a punishment of death unless certain circumstances are shown and that's the law of the land.

and, frankly, you are here because both sides thought you were reasonable and intelligent and you gratified me today because you, obviously, are thoughtful and intelligent and have given this a lot of thought since May. So I like to preface my questions to you by saying, I want you to tell me how you feel because we still have lots of folks around here that -- lots you saw, that many people that afternoon, too.

And we each get about forty-five minutes to talk to you about some of these things and it's not going to be good for you if you have to be shoehorned into what the law is. Because, I guess what I'm trying to say, when we get people down here like you, sadly, it seems like it's a small percentage of the voters, but in any event, you are going to tell us that you are going to follow the law, obviously, because you are going to follow the law.

But this isn't a case of a traffic ticket or a burglary of a house or anything like that. This is literally a life or death decision. And so if we have to -- if we have to do anything that bothers your conscience, one way or the other, we would like to know that because we have other folks that we could talk to. And nobody wants to put that burden on somebody who is not -- and I'll use your word "comfortable" with it.

So I want to talk to you a little bit about your perspective of this and let you tell me some things. Unfortunately, the State has to run through a lot of law, so you know what is being discussed. And I'm going to let you just talk to me a little bit after my five-minute introductory.

First of all, just something I saw in your questionnaire. Are you on commission?

A. Yes, ma'am.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. So if you are off the two weeks before Thanksgiving, is that going to be an undue hardship?
  - A. Yes, ma'am. Well, it's going to hurt, yeah.
- Q. We need to know things like that because sometimes things -- I notice that your children work, but they are in college. Do you assist them in paying their college tuition bills?
  - A. Yes, ma'am.

Q. Sometimes there are things going on in people's lives that prey on their minds. We wouldn't want someone to come up here if their mother was dying of cancer, despite the fact that they would be the best juror in the world, because we may not have that person's full attention simply because they are human beings with a life outside this courtroom.

Would the -- if you were selected for this jury and you were seated on this jury, do you think you would be concerned about the amount of money that you would lose?

A. Yes, ma'am.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Only you can answer this. Do you think that it might distract you to the extent that you couldn't give this your total and full attention?
- A. Well, it just depends on what type of activity was going on during the trial. I get a lot of my business by phone call. And if I got home each evening and had a lot of phone calls to return and people need me at their house to measure and quote for different projects, very well could distract me.

THE COURT: Let me tell you how we run this court.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.

NANCY BREWER, OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

THE COURT: On time. You were asked to

be here at 8:30, you are in the seat at 8:35. We work business hours, take an hour and a half for lunch. You can use the phone. You can use your cell phone back there. We quit between 4:30 and 5:00. We take a break in the morning and a break in the afternoon.

I understand that people have to use the phone to take care of business. Obviously, you can't go out and the measure during the day. You can do that after we get through here. But I'm not going to shut you down for two full weeks. Does that help somewhat?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, yes, yes, that does.

Q. (By Ms. Busbee) So you could do your measuring after business hours?

- A. In some cases I probably could. Some cases I wouldn't be able to get in unless it was working hours.

  Some cases I probably could go in the evenings.
- Q. Well, understanding now how this process works, do you think -- and only you can tell us and I don't -- we ask enough personal questions in this thing that I'm just going to ask you to search your -- search your mind and search your heart and tell us if you think that because you have to -- you are on commission sales, sitting in here for two weeks under the conditions that the Judge described would distract you to some extent?

- A. Well, I'm not so concerned about the mental distraction. If I was told I needed to be here, I would be here and I would do my best. The only thing, it would hurt me probably more financially than anything, to be real honest with you. Two weeks during that time, that's a busy time of the year before Thanksgiving and before Christmas because it takes about six weeks for these products to be manufactured and everybody wants them before Christmas. So it's a busy time and so I would be out financially.
- Q. Well, you are not saying that you are a bad person, if you are admitting that you are concerned about your job and supporting your family. That's kind of what we expected you to be when you came up here. I just, you know, there are folks that get paid for coming to jury duty because they are on salary and there are people that have money and aren't -- or are retired and they can devote all their time and attention to this.

And that doesn't make you a bad juror.

The only thing that makes somebody a bad juror in my mind is someone who holds back something that might concern us in the future. Because once you are on, it's irreversible.

So if you really think that might be bothering you and could distract you in any way from what is going on here, we would like to know that. I don't think anybody at these tables wants anyone who is kind enough to

answer our questions as seriously as you have to suffer a hardship for it.

- A. Well, I think I have answered that.
- Q. It's going to bother you?
- A. It's going to financially burden me, yes.
- Q. I mean, you know, when I'm short on my bank account, it consumes my thoughts. I'm just wondering if you think it may distract you to the extent that you couldn't give, whatever, your full attention, normally it's two weeks of testimony, that might be preying on your mind to the extent that you might not be able to give it your full attention, in all honesty.
- A. Well, I'm not going to say, yeah, I know for a fact that it would, because if my phone isn't ringing during those two weeks for some reason, then it wouldn't bother me.
  - Q. Has that ever happened?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. It's kind of a roller coaster. My business is

  -- it gets busy and gets slow and gets busy and gets slow.

  And I'm anticipating that to be a busy time. And if I

  wasn't able to respond or be there when they needed me

  there, then I would more than likely be a little distracted.
- Q. Be worried about it? I mean, I would. Okay. Just tell me, do you think that if based on the time that this trial will be held, that your financial burdens and your duties of your job would be distracting to give your

full attention than, say, you might be able to give us in January when your busy time was over?

A. Yeah, if we could do it in January.

THE COURT: We can't do that, sir. She's asked it 18 different ways. Anybody that serves up here, it's financially difficult. It's like paying taxes.

Business is not a reason.

Her question is, can you listen to the testimony and judge this case on what you hear from the witness stand or are you going to be so worried about your business that you can't listen to the testimony?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Probably somewhere in the middle, quite honestly.

THE COURT: Very well, move on.

- Q. (By Ms. Busbee) You will be somewhat distracted, then?
  - A. Yes, ma'am.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Now, we talked -- I think capital murder is pretty clear in your mind as it is to most people in this instance. It's alleged to have been either murder in the course of a robbery or the murder of a police officer in the lawful discharge of his duties. And you are familiar, I guess, with the basic facts of what this case is.

But I'm not asking you about this case.

I'm asking you about the scheme that we have in this state

for assessing the death penalty.

And so let's assume that you are sitting on a jury and you have found beyond a reasonable doubt that that person is guilty of the offense of capital murder. And the first question that you come to is that question of foreseeability. You think that person would be a danger in the future.

Could you tell us -- you said earlier that you felt like the fact that someone had committed a capital murder was a pretty big sign to you that they would be dangerous in the future. Would you expand on that and tell me what you were thinking when you said that?

- A. Well, I guess I'm a little confused. Is that a two-part question?
  - Q. Well --

- A. If I were to say that somebody was going to be a problem in the future, I would have to know a lot more about that individual and that individual's background and a lot more than I know now of the facts that we're prosecuting that individual about or I would not be able to make that judgment.
- Q. When you -- typically -- so let's just talk about in a typical case when you are asked to find somebody guilty or not guilty. You don't get to hear all the other things about that person. It's usually just focused in on

what happened around the indictment, around that. Haven't -- not things that happened before or after, anything like that. Subsequent to that.

Let's say you found some hypothetical person guilty beyond a reasonable doubt of a capital murder. Now you go into the second phase of the trial and the first question that you have got to answer is do you think that person would be a danger in the future? Let's say you want to hear something about the defendant and his circumstances. Do you want to hear that from the defendant's table, anything from us about his history or anything that relates to that question?

- A. Yes, ma'am. I would like to get all the facts from anybody and everybody about that individual and at least even if they are not going to talk about the past, at least all the facts that are involved in the particular case he's being tried for.
  - Q. Sure, and you can do that.
- A. And that would be the only way that I could make an assessment on whether or not he would be a danger in the future. That's the facts that I can get at this point. I sure don't know that.
- Q. Right. Sadly, we have to ask you questions based on a no fact situation for the most part.
  - A. Yes, ma'am.

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

A. Um, yes, ma'am.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. I mean, what the law is is one thing, but how you feel about it is what we have you up here and drilling you about. And most people take capital murder very seriously. And we would really need to hear from the defense in some way to reassure them if they were going to say that he wasn't going to be a danger in the future. Is that a fair statement of how you feel about it?
- A. Yes, ma'am. I just think that -- I'm not sure on the law, whether it's the defense's responsibility to prove that the person is not going to be a danger to society. And that may be something that's up to each individual juror, but it's certainly something that I would have to make that assessment after hearing all the facts as a juror.
- Q. Okay. Well, it's not my job. It's not the defense's job. The way the law is written -- and I know that you want to say that you are going to follow the law. I just want to know how you feel about it.
- A. Well, I guess what I would have to say about that is I know I would be responsible making that decision as a juror on whether or not a person is going to be a

threat to society, so I need all the information I can about that particular case and that particular individual to -- in order to make that assessment because I do have to make that assessment.

Q. Sure. And it sounds like you are going to take it pretty seriously. I guess what I'm asking you is in your -- despite the fact that the law says I don't have to prove anything to you in the negative as far as he won't be a danger in the future, I don't have to, in other words, for you to decide that he wasn't going to have to be -- we usually have them up there, so it's easy to refer to them.

But in order for you as a juror to say this man will not be a danger in the future, you need to hear something from us to reassure you, because that's just the way you feel about it?

A. No, ma'am.

Q. Okay. The second Special Issue, has to do with anticipation. We were talking about in this case a theory that if the defendant was a party to an offense. In other words, a participant of some kind, but as they have said, not actually someone who pulled the trigger.

What sort of facts can you think of that would let you know or satisfy you that someone would have anticipated or would have anticipated, not should have anticipated, but did anticipate, that this capital murder

would occur? What sort of things would you need to hear?

- A. I believe if everybody was armed with a weapon would be a pretty strong red flag. You know, I'm just going cold blinder, but any kind of preplan about we're going to do this, we're going to be here at this time, we're going to go this, you are going to do that, there may be a scheme written down on paper somewhere. I don't know. But anything like that that was preplanned. Obviously, if everybody involved was armed -- gosh, I'm having a hard time thinking of all the little things. But there are a lot of little things that to me would put up a red flag that they were anticipating some violence.
- Q. Okay. So you mean anticipating or planning a robbery or anticipating planning a murder?
  - A. Probably both.
- Q. Well, let me just make sure I have this -- I think you are telling me that you would -- that you understand -- we're not looking at them, so let me double check. The question is anticipated that the murder would occur.
  - A. Okay.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. And would your answer be the same not anticipate the crime would occur, but anticipate that a murder would occur?
  - A. Well, I still think being armed would be a red

flag that, you know, not too many people carry a weapon without using it and usually when they use it, there's a death involved is the way I see it.

Q. Okay. Now, let's take you to the mythical hypothetical capital murder jury that you are sitting on and you have found beyond a reasonable doubt that this person is guilty of capital murder as a party. And you found that they may be a danger in the future and you have found that they anticipated that a death would occur and all these things you have found beyond a reasonable doubt.

Do you remember what Mr. Wirskye talked to you about, this safety valve thing? It's kind of a, without sounding too girlie, to me mitigation is difficult to explain, but I like to say mitigation softens your feelings or softens your heart and aggravating hardens your heart toward an individual.

A. Yes, ma'am.

- Q. Would you be able to, after having decided in a case of capital murder that someone was -- had done it, they were going to be dangerous, and they knew this murder was going to happen, could you consider answering that question that they should not get the death penalty? I mean you, yourself, personally, do you think that you could do that or do you think you just couldn't?
  - A. Well, I think that I could, depending on what

the -- what was the term again? Not aggravated, but --

Q. Mitigating.

- A. Mitigating. If there was some strong mitigation or whatever the word would be, yeah, I could consider.
- Q. Because what we want -- at least I'm speaking for this table, is someone who is not just a knee jerk, I'm going to give someone the death penalty. No matter that they really understand what we're talking about here and going to give this table a fair shake on, under the statutory scheme under the law, the way the law is, not the way we think about it when we are sitting around drinking coffee in the morning with our friends, just talking about the news.
- A. The mitigation would have to be substantial. I mean, it would have to be something without a shadow of a doubt or that sort of thing proven to me. But, yeah, if there was something -- can't think of a good cause, but a mental retardation or something, that would be something I have to consider.
- Q. See, mental retardation takes the death penalty away anyway, so we wouldn't be talking about mental retardation.
- A. Something along those lines. You know what I mean, I think.

- Q. I want to be sure you understand that.
- A. I didn't know that, no. And I know it now.
- Q. We could go through this all day long, but I'm trying to get a feel for you. And, as I say, we don't want to torture people. We have more people down the road we can use, if there's some problem that you have with the law or service. And as I understand it, the only problem that you have is you will be halfway distracted by your business problems from full attention to the facts of the case?
  - A. Yes, ma'am.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. I don't necessarily or know at this point what is going to happen in this trial in some respects.

Everybody has heard that you have the right not to testify.

You don't have to -- I hate to use the word "incriminate",
but you don't have to testify in a trial. You being any
person on trial in this country.

Would that concern you on the issue of punishment, if you hadn't heard from the defendant himself?

- A. Me, personally, I think it probably would.
- Q. You would need to hear?
- A. I'm a pretty much of a people person and I've always just talked to people eye to eye. And, yeah, I would want to hear from a defendant.
- Q. Okay. Well -- and that's why we bring you up here to find out what your true feelings are. And you don't

- -- are you saying you wouldn't feel comfortable answering those questions without having heard from the defendant like mitigation and dangerousness and --
- A. I think it would be harder to answer those questions without hearing from the defendant, but I understand that that's what y'all do is speak for the person, so we still have to take the same information and dissect it and make our circumstances. But just me personally, I would -- I would just pick up on some things I wouldn't pick up from if I heard directly from an individual, you know, from the person.
- Q. I'm trying to think of how to ask this properly. So in reality, if the defendant didn't testify, it would make a difference to you in answering some of the Special Issues just in yourself?
  - A. I'm sorry, repeat that?

- Q. Well, if the defendant didn't testify, not my defendant, but in a case where you are being asked to assess a death penalty, if the defendant didn't testify, of course, depending on the facts which we're not talking about now, it might weigh against them because you need -- there would be something you would want to know before you could answer some of those questions in his favor. It's just how --
  - A. I can't answer that without --
  - Q. Answer it with what you want to say.

- Q. Okay. So it would -- in a hypothetical case, if the defendant didn't testify, your feeling is that you might hold it against him because you would want to know some of these things?
  - A. No, ma'am, I didn't say that.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Then tell me. I'm not getting the sense of it. You said that you would need to hear from him?
- A. No, it would be -- I think the information that the jury would get hearing from the defendant would be something that the defense couldn't -- couldn't put out there to the jury.
- Q. Okay. In other words his mouthpiece, so to speak, his lawyers, can't tell you things that the defendant -- about the defendant. You know, you made the comment that we speak for our client, but you would really prefer to hear the defendant, look him in the eye, and hear the tone of his voice, to assess his character, I guess, is what you are saying, right?
  - A. Yes. I would like to hear from the defendant,

not necessarily to assess his character, but to hear what he has to say and to pick up on vibes, if you will, and to just hear what he has to say.

- Q. And if that person should choose for whatever reason not to testify, would that be something that you would think about when you were answering these questions? Would it weigh against him?
- A. I don't think -- I don't think it would weigh against him. I think there would be a little bit of a void in putting the whole package together in answering the questions that we would have -- that I would have to put together. There would be a little bit of a void there, I believe.
- Q. So, in other words, if the defendant didn't testify in one of these situations, maybe, and you have been -- correct me if I'm not saying the position right, so go ahead and do that if I'm not. But you are saying without that, it would be a little bit easier for the State to meet its burden of proof?
  - A. I don't know.
  - Q. Just tell me -- just --
- A. I don't know that it would help the State, either. I'm just talking a juror, and me personally, I can't speak for any other juror --
  - Q. Sure.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

-- I have to take all the facts and I've got Α. to make three decisions at some point in time. And I believe it would make those decisions easier and there probably -- and maybe could be some more information that would come about directly from a defendant's person rather than his supposed persons. Q. Sure. Α. And to me that would be -- I would not want to miss that day. You know what I mean? 10 0. So you are saying it would be important to you 11 Α. Yes, ma'am. 12 ο. -- to hear from the defendant? 13 Yes, ma'am. A. 14 Well, I think I have tortured you enough, 15 Q. Mr. Emery. 16 MS. BUSBEE: I'll surrender the juror. 17 THE COURT: I have one question to follow 18 up on the last issue you stopped in midsentence. The LAW on 19 the issue of a person testifying, the law is the Fifth 20 Amendment of the United States Constitution, guarantees that 21 he does not have to testify. 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 23 THE COURT: You have told me it would 24

make your job more difficult. You have told us that you

```
would like to hear from the defendant. But her question and
    the question of the law is the law says he does not have to
    testify. And if he chooses not to testify, I will instruct
    you that you cannot and must not allude to that fact
    throughout your deliberations or take it into consideration
    for any purpose whatsoever.
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                            Yes.
                        THE COURT: Can you do that?
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                            I don't know.
                                                           That's
10
    a pretty big issue to me.
11
                       THE COURT: Pretty big issue.
12
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
13
                       THE COURT: You would like to hear from
    him?
14
15
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                            Yes.
16
                       THE COURT: Make your job more difficult,
    but the law says he doesn't have to testify.
17
18
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                           Yes.
                       THE COURT: Are you going to hold it
19
    against him, if he chooses not to testify?
20
21
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I wouldn't sav I
    would hold it against him, maybe against the judicial
22
23
    system.
             I don't know. But there's going to be a void
    there.
24
25
                       THE COURT: Sure there's going to be a
```

void.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I would like to hear from him and it's going to be an issue that's going to be hard to overlook, if I'm asked to answer these three questions and possibly convict somebody to a life sentence and not even be able to hear from them. It's going to be difficult for me.

THE COURT: Difficult is fine.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It's going to be difficult for me to not allude to it or think about it to answer your question. But I wouldn't hold it against him.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Wait for us outside. We'll have you back in just a minute.

[Prospective juror out]

THE COURT: What says the State?

MR. WIRSKYE: State has no challenge for

cause.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. BUSBEE: Are you asking me? Your Honor, I challenge the juror for cause. I don't believe this juror can adequately afford my client his Fifth Amendment privilege not to testify. He stated to the Court it would make a difference to him and his decision as to whether or not he would give a life or death sentence. He said ever which way you could he would consider it and it would be negative to the defense.

And I am challenging him for cause based on his inability to honor the defendant's Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination.

THE COURT: Let me have a few minutes.

(Recess)

with a typical vacillating juror back and forth, back and forth. I can put this man on the jury, find him to be qualified very easily. But I'm real, real careful about my constitutional issues. I gave him the law and he just, in my mind, being honest and would not be able to give Mr.

Murphy his constitutional right against self-incrimination.

As much as I don't want to, I can't let the fact we spent an hour and a half with this man and just punt. I'm going to grant your challenge for cause. Take ten minutes and we'll start on the next one. Bring him back in.

## [Prospective juror in]

THE COURT: Mr. Emery, thank you for your service today and your honesty to the questions. You are not going to be seated on this jury. Thank you, sir. You are free to go.

(Recess)

[Prospective juror in]

THE COURT: Erica Marie Hefner. How are

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm good. How are

you?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Do you go by Erica or Marie?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Erica.

THE COURT: I'll be sure and get my computer corrected and lined up here. Thank you for being here. Did you have enough time this morning to read over the juror orientation guide several times? I know I put a lot of law in front of you and we don't expect you to be able to understand it all, just by reading it. The attorneys are going to spend some time with you going over the law and provide some examples so you can make it a little more understanding. Don't think you've got to have a law degree to come here and be a juror in this case. All we need to remind you is to be honest.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.

THE COURT: If you don't understand the questions, say I don't understand or give me another example and they'll be happy to help you out that way. My job is, A, do you understand the law? Second is can you follow the law? We don't want you to be intimidated. It's somewhat of an unusual situation for a citizen to come in and be on the witness stand and look at all these lawyers here. That's the only way that we can do it. It's not like a big group

```
where you were in with 800 people that Friday morning.
    something that's very personal. They want to get to know
    your feelings, how you think.
                        The only question that I have for you is
    you have read the trial shall begin on November 10th.
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Mine said the 11th,
    but, okay.
                        THE COURT: Does it say November 10th on
    the front page?
10
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                            Yes. It's okay.
    Either date is fine.
11
12
                        THE COURT: Can you serve us for two
    weeks?
13
14
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Uh-huh.
                        THE COURT: Thank you so much.
15
    Mr. Shook.
16
17
                            ERICA HEFNER,
    having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as
18
19
    follows:
20
                         DIRECT EXAMINATION
    BY MR. SHOOK:
21
22
                  Ms. Hefner, I'll be asking you questions on
    behalf of the State and we're just looking for your honest
23
    answers and opinions. Have you ever been down on jury duty
24
    before?
25
```

- Α. No. Q., First time? Α. Uh-huh. Usually in most cases the jury selection is done in a big group. Α. Right. But since it's a capital murder case in which Q. the death penalty is being sought, we talk to each juror individually. Gives you an opportunity to discuss any questions at any time. Okay? 10 Uh-huh. 11 Α. 0. You have given us a lot of information on your 12 questionnaire. We appreciate that. I'm going to follow up 13 on some of that and I'm going to ask you a lot of questions 14 about the death penalty and how you feel about that and some 15 of the laws that apply. 16 Okay. 17 Α. Q. You grew up here in the Dallas area? 18
  - A. Yes, I did.
  - Q. Did you grow up in Dallas itself?
  - A. Uh-huh.

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. What area of town did you grow up in?
- A. The White Rock area.
- Q. What school did you go to?
- A. Bishop Lynch.

- Q. And the only time out of Dallas is when you went to a school down in Austin?
- A. I went to San Marcos to school and then I lived in Austin for several years after that. I just moved back to Dallas in March.
  - Q. What brought you back to Dallas?
  - A. My company.
  - Q. Okay. The 24-Hour Fitness?
  - A. Uh-huh.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. What do you do for them?
- A. Um, I do a lot of things. Right now I do some corporate sales and some personal training and I'm in management training, so I kind of get a wide scope.
  - Q. So you look at everything?
  - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. And you told the Court that the two-week time period that you would be required to be down here wouldn't be a problem?
  - A. No.
- Q. Now, let me ask you, you know, we can't get into the facts of the case, but we gave a few facts in the questionnaire regarding this case when it happened back at the Oshman's on December 24 of 2000.
  - A. Uh-huh.
  - Q. Do you recall any of the facts surrounding

this case at all? I was graduating from college in December No. of 2000 so I had a lot of other things on my mind. I wasn't really current with current events. So you didn't follow it any at any time? Q. Huh-huh. Α. Q. You don't know anything? Α. No. Let me ask you how you feel, generally, about Q. the death penalty? Are you in favor of it as a law? 10 Α. Um, yes. 11 Tell me what purpose you think the death Ο. 12 penalty serves. 13 I think it serves a purpose on an individual 14 basis. If by the law it is warranted, then that's what 15 needs to happen. 16 Okay. Is the death penalty something you have Ο. 17 always believed in as a law? 18 Um, being 24, always believed in it isn't that 19 long, but pretty much, yeah. 20 What do you think led you to that belief? Q. 21 Just the way you were raised or --22 Um, I'm not sure. I've -- I've always 23

24

if that's the law we have in place, then that's what needs to be upheld.

- Q. If it were up to you, let's make you Governor for a day and you get to decide which laws we have, would you have a death penalty statute?
- A. I would have to look at the amount of criminals and what type of criminals that we would have in our state and what's happening to them now and money as to how much it's costing to keep them in jail for life. Or there are a lot of other statistics. I would have to look a lot.
- Q. For what you know about the type of crime we have in Texas, do you think that we should have the death penalty?
  - A. I don't know enough to say yes or no.
- Q. Okay. Any cases you have followed in the media that you think warrant the death penalty or would be the types of cases you think should be considered for the death penalty?
  - A. No.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Well, what comes to mind when you think of a death penalty case? What type case should be at least something the death penalty should be looked at?
  - A. Um, I remember the yogurt shop murders.
  - Q. Down in Austin?

A. Yeah.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. That was pretty --
- A. Gruesome.
- Q. Gruesome and got a lot of publicity. If it were up to you, would you just reserve the death penalty for where a life was taken or would you have it for other problems like rape and stuff like that?
  - A. Mainly for when a life is taken.
- Q. In your questionnaire -- and I know you don't have the questionnaire in front of you. It's been a while since you filled it out. But we asked a lot of questions. And on one we asked what's important to you in deciding whether a person receives the death or life sentence? And you put several things, mental state of both victims and suspected murderer at the time, chain of events leading up to the supposed crime, and the scientific evidence in place. What were you thinking there? Go a little farther.
- A. As far as mental state, was the person who committed the crime mentally altered, be it by a substance or by their own physical and mental capacity? What was the other person who was, obviously, killed doing at the time to provoke that?
  - Q. What could be important about that?
- A. Well, I don't know if the person was provoked to shoot the person, the other person.

- Q. Okay. So if they provoked it in some way?
- A. Right.
- Q. All right. Shootout between somebody and --
- A. Right.
- Q. Okay. What about the chain of events leading up to the supposed crime? That's just all the facts surrounding the crime?
  - A. Right.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. How about scientific testimony on placement? What did you mean by that?
- A. I was thinking more if there was more than one person -- candidate, that could have been the murderer as far as gun position and bullet entry and that sort of thing.
- Q. Let me follow up on that and talk to you generally about something. In Texas the death penalty is only reserved for certain types of murder cases, first of all, murder that occurs with another aggravating factor.

I could pull a gun out and shoot

Mr. Wirskye in the temple because I didn't like what he was

wearing that day or something he said to me, laugh about it,

but I couldn't get the death penalty. Okay. The death

penalty is reserved for murders that occur during the course

of a felony, rape, or robbery, you break into someone's

home, arson, or kidnap or murder of specific individuals

like a police officer on duty, prison guard on duty, fireman

Those are specific types of cases that the death penalty is reserved for or at least for consideration. Do you disagree with any of those types of cases?

A. No.

10

. 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Do you feel those are all fair types of cases for consideration?
  - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. Now, when we think of the death penalty, the natural assumption one makes or when we think of the person that actually causes the death, the triggerman, that's just normal. But the death penalty or capital murder, like any other crime, there could have been more than one person, sometimes, carries out a crime. It's an issue we talk about.

An example we give sometimes is Mr. Wirskye and I here, we might decide we want to go rob a bank and we get another friend of ours to be the getaway driver to wait outside to warn us if the police are coming. We go in. I have guns. Mr. Wirskye doesn't have a gun. His role is to take a bag out on one side. And I pull the gun on the tellers and threaten them. He will gather the money up and

I will cover. Okay?

But let's say we pull that plan off. I get mad or maybe I think, you know, Mr. Wirskye warns me that one of them is going to hit an alarm. I shoot one of the tellers and kill them. I mean to. We run off, but we get captured.

I can, obviously, be tried for capital murder and could receive the death penalty because I pulled the trigger and caused someone's death in the course of a robbery. Common sense. Do you agree with that?

A. Right.

Q. The law says that because Mr. Wirskye and the getaway driver assisted me in the crime, they could, under some particular facts, could, also, be prosecuted for capital murder and could even receive the death penalty, even though they are not the triggerman.

Now, that's a point people, some jurors, agree with some of that and it's fine if you do or don't. Some people, if it were up to them, would reserve the death penalty for the triggerman, have no problem with that. They do have a problem with the party or the accomplice who's not the triggerman and personally could not assess the death penalty if it was an accomplice or something where they would draw the line and they couldn't do it.

And if you feel that way, it's fine, too.

Some people don't have -- how do you feel about the nontriggerman situation, the accomplice, and the death penalty?

- A. I wouldn't be really quick to assign the death penalty to a nontrigger party. However, if the event led to shooting an armed and identified police officer, I might be more willing to assess the death penalty just because of who was killed.
- Q. And that's because of the particular type of victim?
  - A. Right.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Okay. So in a police officer situation, if someone, an accomplice, the example I gave the police officer was somehow involved, maybe in the bank or something, and I killed him, you think it would be fair to prosecute Mr. Wirskye for the death penalty and could receive it as an accomplice because he's assisting me in that offense?
- A. I don't know. I don't -- I don't think I would, actually, just because he didn't kill him.
- Q. Okay. So thinking about it a little further, then, maybe if it were up to you, if you were in charge of the law, you would reserve the death penalty just for the triggerman?
  - A. Yes.

1	Q. Not the accomplice?
2	A. Yeah.
. 3	Q. Okay. It's fair to feel that way. I know you
4	probably haven't thought about these subjects in great
5	detail, I hope you haven't, at 24-Hour Fitness. But
6	thinking about it now, that's how you feel?
7	A. Yes, yes.
8	MR. SHOOK: Judge, could we approach?
9	THE COURT: You may.
10	(Bench conference)
11	THE COURT: Ms. Hefner, we appreciate
12	your time and service to the Court. At this time the
13	parties have agreed to excuse you. You will not be on this
14	jury.
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.
16	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you so much.
17	[Prospective juror out]
18	THE COURT: Ask Mr. Ingle to come in.
19	[Prospective juror in]
20	THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Ingle, how
21	are you?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Fine. How are you,
23	sir?
24	THE COURT: I have your name as Marty
25	Delbert Ingle. What name do you go with?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Marty with a D?

THE COURT: M-A-R-D-Y. And the jury

summons came up M-A-R-T-Y and I couldn't tell if it was M-A-R-D-Y. And I said, well, I need to ask him about that.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: On my birth

certificate it will probably say T, but my mom said I should spell it with a D and girls spell it with a T, so change it on my birth certificate is too much, but I spell it with a D.

THE COURT: I have to stick with what your birth certificate says. But the Texas pronunciation is more of a Marty. But I'm going to leave it with a T, if that's what your birth certificate is. All right?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's fine.

THE COURT: Mr. Ingle, have you had an opportunity to read the orientation guide there for you? I have provided you a copy of that short questionnaire that you filled out for us in May. If they need to refer to a specific question and you need to review your answer, you have it there before you.

Today the lawyers will go over the law more in detail. Obviously, when I gave you that guide, that's a lot of law to put on someone and expect you to understand how it all interlinks. The lawyers are going to speak to you about it and give you examples to where it will

be easier to understand how it works and the process that we have to go through.

What you need to be able to do for us is just tell us the truth. If you don't understand something, tell us, and they will try to explain it. If they can't explain it or they get you confused, I'll get in the middle of it.

Only question I have for you, this trial will begin on November 10th, last for approximately two weeks and I don't expect two full weeks, but it will be a two-part process. You will have breaks in the morning and certainly for lunch and the afternoon. You will be able to use the phone during that period of time. You are not going to be sequestered. You won't be locked up at night in a hotel room unless it's an extraordinary situation and that would only be for one night, if deliberations carry over.

So that's just -- I don't have a crystal ball, but that's what I anticipate that the trial will be able to do for us. Do you have any problems serving the Court for those two weeks?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, I'm a contract worker and when I'm not there, I don't get paid. And that's a substantial amount of time that would affect me financially.

THE COURT: Yes. Everybody who comes in

here, I've had chairmen of the board of Fortune 500 companies and his time was worth thousands of dollars an hour. I understand that. I've had doctors, I've had lawyers -- lawyers are the worst ones, okay, because they -- lawyers, the whole deal is by the hour. And we understand it's going to be a financial hardship for anyone to sit on this case. I can't let you -- I can't let business reasons excuse someone from the jury service. But I will tell you we understand that and I will work -- let you work around as best we can.

The question that the lawyers have is, if your particular financial situation will be so overburdened that you would not be able to sit in this courtroom and listen to testimony in this case, that's the real core issue.

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Um, well, I don't know about that, but --

THE COURT: See, what it gets down to really is it going to be so overburdened --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I won't like it.

THE COURT: No. I can't find anybody that likes being down here, trust me. And if someone does, they -- we usually don't want them, you see, because they have an axe to grind.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Right.

THE COURT: Right. So you see the position we're in? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Right. THE COURT: Nobody wants to be involved. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Actually, if I was working for the company, got paid, it wouldn't bother me if they were paying my time. But in this particular case, it's a different situation. I usually work for a company with benefits and I don't have that at this point in time, so 10 that's the problem. I wouldn't mind, but to sit here and knowing that it takes a pretty good -- anyway, you know the story. It probably wouldn't detract me from the issues, but 12 I don't like it. 13 14 THE COURT: I understand. 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: You know. 16 THE COURT: Trust me, I understand. will do all I can do to not waste your time, get you in and 17 get you out and get you down the road. Fair enough? 18 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sure, I guess. 20 THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Mr. Wirskye? 21 MARTY INGLE, having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as 22 follows: 23 24

**DIRECT EXAMINATION** 

BY MR. WIRSKYE:

Ο. May it please the Court? Mr. Ingle, how are you? Α. Fine. Q. We're sorry about that work situation. That's all right. Α. We'll talk about it in just a second, but my name is Bill Wirskye. I'm going to be the Assistant District Attorney that's going to visit with you the next few minutes. Where is Mark Tree, (phonetic) Arkansas? Α. Close to Memphis, a little north of the Delta 10 land. 11 I have people in southwest Arkansas, but I Q. 12 have never heard of Mark Tree. 13 Α. The flat side. 14 How long did you live there? Q. 15 About 18, 19, 20 years. A. 16 Q. And then you came here in the Metroplex kind 17 of --18 I came to Houston in '79 and then up to A. 19 Dallas. 20 What type of work do you do? You told us you Q. 21 are contract now and I notice it said Ratheon? 22 TI slash Ratheon, for 20 years. 23 Α. Your free time, what do you like to do in your Q. 24 free time? 25

- A. Relax.
- Q. Looks like --
- A. Pardon?

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. It looks like you play music; is that right?
- A. Yeah, I like to do that.
- Q. What type of music do you play?
- A. Country, blues, and gospel, not necessarily in that order.
- Q. We read a lot of people -- you listen to 95.9 (phonetic)?
  - A. That ought to tell you something there.
- Q. We know no one wants to be down here,
  Mr. Ingle. I know it's a big inconvenience to everybody,
  financially and otherwise. As the Judge said, the bottom
  line question is are you going to let something that's going
  on in your life or in your mind affect you listening to the
  testimony in the trial and affect the decisions you may
  make? You know, if it's that great a deal, it's that great
  a burden to you where it might affect your decisions in the
  case, that's what we need to know about it.
- A. It just dawned on me, I'm probably in a position where I could work a second shift, if I had to. So I guess you could take it out of me. It wouldn't bother me so much. It would be a long day.
  - Q. It would be a long day. Neither side wants

5

7

9

11

10

12

13

14 15

16

18

19 20

21

23

24

you to think about something else or be sleepy from working a different shift. We don't want you to miss something in the courtroom and that type of thing. Do you think it's going to be that type situation?

- A. I'm a Judge Judy fan, so there you go.
- Q. All right.
- A. Pay attention.
- Q. So you think that you could just make your decision based on what you hear in the -- on what you hear in the courtroom?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. I want to visit with you a little bit about how you feel about the death penalty, since this is a case where we're seeking the death penalty. Talk to you a little bit about some of the information in your questionnaire that I think you have got in front of you and then, finally, maybe talk a little bit about the law that might apply in this case. So are you okay up there?
  - A. It's tight.
- Q. Now, you have told us that you generally are in favor of the death penalty; is that right?
- A. Generally in favor of the death penalty would be a correct statement.
- Q. Can you tell us what purpose you think it serves society, having the death penalty?

- A. Well, I would hope it would make somebody think twice before they just kill somebody, you know.
  - Q. Okay. Deterrent effect?
  - A. Exactly, deterrent.
- Q. Is there any particular type case that comes to mind that you think of when you think of an appropriate case for the death penalty or capital punishment?
- A. Just deliberated murder and, you know, I am -- I believe in our cops, you know, I think they ought to be protected at all costs.
  - Q. Oh, sure.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- A. I believe they're special people.
- And, you know, a lot of people feel strongly about it like you do and the -- I guess the overriding concern in all this, we talk to a lot of people and we get them to put their views in the questionnaires. And you can be strongly in favor of the death penalty or you cannot be in favor of the death penalty. You can have your own personal views and opinions, thoughts.

The bottom line to all of this is would you be able to put that aside and be able to follow the law and do what the law says? And as we go along, I'm going to ask you a lot of those type questions. And you may not know that in Texas we only reserve a certain portion or certain

subset of murders for the death penalty.

You know, let's just say Mr. Shook here, I've been working with him on this case for a long time and I decided that I don't like him. I deliberate on it a while and plan it and I come into court one morning and shoot him dead in front of everybody in the court. If that's the case, that particular type murder wouldn't be subject to the death penalty. Okay?

One way to think about capital murder is it's always a murder plus something else. Kind of like you said, a special person, police officer on duty, firefighter or prison guard or a young child under the age of six or cases where an intentional murder is committed during the course of another felony like robbery or burglary. Somebody breaks into your home and kills you is capital murder. Somebody holds up the 7-Eleven down the street and kills the clerk, that type of thing is capital murder.

Does that kind of make sense to you, the scheme we have?

> Α. Somewhat, yeah.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- We talk to a lot of people that say, hey, I Q. think it should be an option for all murder cases. Texas we reserve it for that certain or particular type of murder.
  - I didn't know that.

- Q. Most people don't. We talk to a lot of people. Some would like to expand the available group of murder cases, you know, that it would be available for and some want to shrink it. Sounds like you might be in favor of making it available in more different types of murders; is that right?
- A. Possibly. I mean, if you thought -- if you were going to kill that guy right there just like you said you were going to do, I don't know, you know, you need to go, too.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. And I may have been to prison five or six times, may be the baddest of the bad. But, you know, I just want to make sure.
- A. With you, that's just my thought on it for whatever. I don't deal with this on a daily basis and don't plan on it. So that's why you guys are there.
- Q. And I hope you hadn't spent too much time thinking about it.
  - A. I haven't and don't care to.
- Q. I just want to let you know, it's okay to have your views.
- A. I don't know what you were talking about. You drew the line and this gets this and this don't. I didn't know that.
  - Q. But like I said, regardless of what your view

is, the bottom line question is always going to be can you kind of set that aside and just follow the law that the Judge gives you and that type thing? So that's probably a question I'm going to be asking you a lot as we visit and stuff.

Let me ask you this. Usually when you think of that type of capital murder you think of one person, I guess, going into a 7-Eleven, holding up the clerk, shooting and killing the clerk, and getting off with the money. But oftentimes crimes are committed by more than one person. You know, maybe a group of guys or gang of guys get together and commit the crime.

In Texas the death penalty is not necessarily reserved just for the person that actually pulls the trigger. Okay? What I mean by that is depending on the facts and circumstances, even though I'm a nontriggerman, I could still potentially face the death penalty.

Some people say, well, they are not really in favor of that. They can just draw a bright line and say the death penalty is only for people that actually pull the trigger and cause the death. And some people say, you know, I just keep an open mind about that and look at the nontriggerman and see if the death penalty is appropriate. Where do you kind of fall?

A. The last.

- Q. Okay. So you wouldn't necessarily take the death penalty off the table, just because somebody didn't pull the trigger; is that right?

  A. Just because they didn't pull the trigger?

  O. Yes.
  - A. Not necessarily.
- Q. Again, a lot of people don't know this and have no reason to know it before you get down here. But if you serve as a juror on a death penalty case, we don't ask the jury to make a decision between the death penalty and life, necessarily. What we ask you to do is to answer a series of three questions that you probably read about.
  - A. Yeah.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. And depending on the answers to those questions, that's what determines the appropriate sentence.
  - A. Right.
- Q. So it's not a situation where we just ask you to decide the death penalty or not. We really require jurors to kind of work through and use some mental discipline and let, you know, the chips fall where they may
  - A. Right.
- Q. -- in respect to the death penalty based on the answers to those questions. Does that seem fair to you?
  - A. Yeah. That seems fair.

Q. Let's say Mr. Shook and I decide we're going to rob a bank. I know he's a bad guy. He's been to prison a couple of times. And the plan is for him to take the gun, go in, and hold up the teller, and I'm going to go in with the bag and collect the money from the bank.

And as we go in to do that, maybe I see the teller reaching for like a silent alarm button and I yell out, hey, they are going for the alarm. Mr. Shook turns around and kills the teller, that type of thing.

Obviously, he's committed capital murder, murder in the course of a robbery. He could face the death penalty. And if a jury thinks that I helped him, aided him, directed him to do that, then I could be convicted of capital murder, or if a jury thinks that I should have anticipated by our plan going in there that somebody could die like that teller, then I could also be found guilty of capital murder. That make sense to you?

A. Yes.

- Q. Okay. A lot of times it comes down to what I should have anticipated. You know, I knew he was a bad guy, knew he had a gun, and I knew he would do whatever it took to get out of there, that type thing. Does that make sense?
- A. Yeah. A couple of things come to my mind in terms --
  - Q. What comes to your mind?

- A. Accusation through association, birds of a feather flock together, so, anyway.
  - Q. And I want to make it real clear.
- A. I think that's what you were saying, basically, in a nutshell.
  - Q. We're talking about the law of accomplices.
  - A. Right.
- Q. If I'm just there, innocent bystander, then I'm not guilty of anything, if I don't know what he's going to do. But if I'm actively helping him or aiding him --
  - A. Right.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. -- and, or if I'm actively helping him to rob that bank and should have anticipated that a life was going to be taken, then I could be on the hook for capital murder and maybe the death penalty, that type of thing. If he tricks me into going, thinking he's -- you know, he says, hey, Bill, we're going to make a withdrawal from the bank. Okay? He didn't tell me what type of withdrawal he's making. And I really in my mind don't know what's going on and I don't help him in any way, I'm not guilty of any crime. Make sense to you?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Just because I'm there means I'm not guilty.

  I have to help him. If you think I helped him, I should have anticipated that a life would be taken, then I could be

convicted of capital murder.

And sounds like that's something, a law that you can follow, that type of thing?

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Okay. Everybody we talked to has probably heard something about this case, kind of figured out from the questionnaire which case this is.
  - A. Uh-huh.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. And what the law says is, you know, we don't need twelve jurors that haven't heard a thing about the case. That would be almost impossible. You know, in a high profile case like this, we would never be able to get a jury. What the law says is, you know, are you able to put out of your mind what you heard, not necessarily forget about it, but put it out of your mind and just base your verdict on what you hear in the courtroom, that type thing.

If you can say that I'll keep an open mind, listen just to the evidence in the courtroom, then you would be a qualified juror. Is that something that you think you would be able to do?

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Okay. What exactly have you heard about this case, Mr. Ingle?
- A. Basically, I guess, seven guys escaped from somewhere and went to Ft. Worth and robbed or attempted to

rob a sporting goods store for something, guns or something.

I don't know. All I know is robbery and a murder, seven guys.

- Q. You got the big picture, but not necessarily a lot of details?
  - A. Right.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

\* 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. It's kind of the same question, talking about your work commitment. Would you be able to kind of put that out of your mind and just make your decision based on what you hear in the courtroom?
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. You understand -- I mean, we do this to insure both sides get a fair trial.
  - A. Right, exactly.
- Q. We don't want jurors thinking about, gee, I should be at work. I'm losing money and miss something. Or we don't want jurors thinking about what I heard on TV two years ago. We want jurors to really concentrate on the evidence to give both sides a fair trial.
  - A. Exactly.
- Q. And I think you can see how important that is. Sounds like that's a law you can follow?
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Okay. As I told you, in a capital murder case, you know, you have got those three questions to answer

on the back.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- A. Yeah.
- Q. Could you flip to those and find them in that book real quick? The first part of the trial, what we call the guilt phase, that's where you as a juror would decide whether he committed capital murder, whether he's guilty of it. And I'll lay all our cards on the table right now. We talked about triggerman, nontriggerman, accomplices. It's our theory in this case and we're prosecuting Mr. Murphy as an accomplice, a nontriggerman. That's how we're prosecuting the case.

The first phase of the trial, it would be up to you as a juror to decide whether the State has proven him guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. Okay?

- A. Uh-huh.
- Q. You find him guilty of capital murder, then we move to that second phase of the trial and that's where you would answer the three questions. Have you had a chance to look at the questions?
- A. The second question was kind of confusing to me, I think.
- Q. Let me talk to you a little bit about that because that's kind of what we've already talked about.

  That's the situation where you do have an accomplice, you know. If you look at that question, the jury would have to

decide whether the person actually caused the death. That would be the triggerman. I told you that's --

A. I've understood that part, I guess, is, basically, I understand whether or not he did that, but then you want to find out whether or not he intended to do some act of murder either there or later on down the line and that kind of -- so what you are, basically, saying, is, you are wanting me to say, do you think he did or didn't do this, but would have or intended to later on down the line, maybe.

Q. Let me see if I can clear it up this way.

I'll do my best. You know, we talked about me. You could convict me of capital murder with Mr. Shook, one, if you think I should have anticipated a life would be taken.

Okay? You could find me guilty.

In order to give me the death penalty, you have to answer this question. You have to be convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that either I pulled the trigger and, you know, in our case I didn't. He did. Or that I intended that that person be killed. That would be a situation maybe where I hire somebody to kill my wife or my business partner, a murder for hire. Or, finally, that I anticipated a human life would be taken.

A. Okay.

Q. It's a little bit different. To find me

guilty you have to think I should have anticipated a life would be taken. In order to answer that question yes and give me the death penalty, you have got to think that I actually anticipated. Okay? That I did anticipate a life would be taken.

And you may think, you know, hey, he knew the plan for the robbery, he knew he had a loaded gun, he knew he was dangerous, Mr. Wirskye, you should have and you did anticipate that a life would be taken.

A. Okay. I get it now.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Does that make sense?
- A. I do now. Intended was the key word there and whether he did or not.
- Q. You know, I'm not the person that pulled the trigger, so you need to decide whether I intended to kill that person or I anticipated that that person could be killed.
  - A. Exactly, I understand it now.
- Q. One way to look at it, I guess, is if you convict someone of capital murder, that person is sitting on a life sentence. Okay? They are going to get a life sentence unless these questions are answered yes, yes, and no. If the questions are answered in a particular way, they are going to get the death penalty.

Some people call these maybe like a set

of filters. You know, you take the facts that you heard in the first part and take the facts that you heard in the second part, run them through these questions, this set of filters, and, like I said, however it shakes out, it shakes out. If it's yes, yes, and no, then it's an automatic death penalty and the Judge would sentence the defendant to death. Does that kind of make a little bit of sense?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. As you look at those first two questions, No. 1 and No. 2, we have the burden at this table to prove to you, the jury, that the answers to those questions should be yes. We've got to do that beyond a reasonable doubt. Okay? Just like we've got to prove the person's guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, we've got to prove to you the answer to these questions should be yes. Their default settings is kind of a no answer.

Looking at Special Issue No. 1, is there a probability that the defendant would commit criminal acts of violence that would constitute a continuing threat to society? That's kind of where we ask the juror to look at all the evidence, what they heard in the first part, what they may have heard in the second part, and decide whether he would be a continuing danger to society, make a prediction, basically.

Is that something that you think you can

do, if you are given enough information?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Okay. As I told you what the law requires, you know, in order to get a fair trial is that the jurors start the second phase of the trial, the punishment phase, where they answer these questions, with an open mind. And none of these questions should be answered automatically, based on what you did in the first part of the trial, the guilt phase.

And let me give you an example of that.

We talked to some people that say, Mr. Wirskye, I find somebody guilty of capital murder, when I get to question No. 1, my mind is already closed. I'm going to answer it automatically every time yes. Because if I find somebody guilty of capital murder, I'm going to think that they are a future danger. You may say there's a lot of common sense to that and that may be true.

But what the law requires you to do and what we ask you to do if you were a juror, is to wait and keep an open mind and look at all that evidence. You know, you may come back to that conclusion, he's going to be a future danger. But the point is, you just can't do it automatically. You kind of have to make this independent inquiry. Does that make sense to you?

A. Yeah. Are you saying that you will go through

one phase of this to come up with a guilty verdict and then you will go and present stuff to make a decision on this?

Two phases?

Q. Exactly. The first phase we're just kind of concerned, you know, like in our situation did we rob the bank, commit capital murder. When we get to the second phase, you are probably going to hear extra information about a person's background, if they had a good background, bad background, and that's to help you answer these three questions. And that's why it's important when you start the second phase of the trial, you go in with that open mind.

I could sit here and give you different sets of facts all day long, where you convict someone of capital murder, but never think they are going to be a future danger. The law doesn't require you to think of anything like that.

But I want to make sure that you can, you know, keep an open mind to that situation. Just because you have convicted somebody of capital murder, you are not going to automatically answer No. 1 yes, and that type of thing.

- A. You have to prove that to me.
- Q. Right. We have to prove it. Exactly. And you can go back and look at the facts of the crime. You just can't make that decision automatically. You can go back and look at the facts of the crime, plus anything else

you may have heard in that second phase. You have to keep that open mind. It can't be automatic. Does that make sense?

A. Yes.

Q. Again, we have the burden of proving that to you beyond a reasonable doubt. If you answer yes to that, you move to the second one, we have kind of already talked about. You know, if you think we have proven beyond a reasonable doubt that a person intended to kill or anticipated a life would be taken, then you would answer that yes as well, and you would finally get down to that third question or that third Special Issue.

Mr. Ingle, what this is, is basically a safety net, a last stop in the process before someone gets sentenced to death. Okay? Before you even get to this question, you have found somebody guilty of capital murder, you have found beyond a reasonable doubt they are going to be that future danger to society. You found beyond a reasonable doubt that they at least anticipated that a life would be taken.

And this question No. 3 asks you to kind of step back from all of that, look at everything you have heard in the entire trial, both phases, and see if there's something there either in the facts of the crime or the facts and background of the person and his personal

culpability, what blame he bears, and see if there's anything there that is mitigating, that lessens his blame, and if there is, is it sufficient that his life ought to be spared, that he not get the death penalty. Does that kind of make sense to you?

A. Uh-huh.

Q. It's just -- it's a last stop to give every benefit of the doubt to the defendant and again, you know, I can give you all sorts of different hypothetical deals. But we need to make sure that you can keep an open mind and at least tell us at this point I can keep an open mind to mitigating evidence. If I hear something that I think is mitigating, that lessens his blame, I can consider that and I'll keep an open mind to that question.

Is that something that you think that you can do?

- A. I think that I can be openminded about it.
- Q. Okay. And this question is a little bit different. We don't have the burden of proof. They don't have the burden of proof. It's just whatever the jury thinks to answer this question yes or no. And the law doesn't necessarily require that you consider anything mitigating. You know, it's just whatever you think. You don't even have to agree with the rest of the jury.

Is there anything off the top of your

- A. What do you mean by mitigating?
- Q. Mitigating would be something -- I guess, take my case for example.
  - A. Uh-huh.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. That would lessen my personal moral culpability maybe. Maybe I had a change of heart after the teller got killed and I called 911. You could think that was mitigating. Maybe I've never been in trouble before, don't have a criminal record. You can think that's mitigating. Maybe I was real young. Maybe I was 18 years old. Some people think that could be potentially mitigating. Maybe I have some sort of mental defect or something. I still know the difference between right and wrong, not really mentally retarded, but I have some issues, that type of thing.

Is there anything other than those that maybe comes to mind for you, something that might be mitigating?

- A. No.
- Q. That's the most common answer we get, because I hope you don't sit around thinking about this, you probably never thought about this. Like I said, you don't have to consider anything mitigating. You just have to say,

gee, I could keep an open mind to it. You know, maybe that situation or --

- A. I get it. Mitigating, I didn't understand that, what that meant.
- Q. It's kind of opposite of aggravating. You know, I may shoot Mr. Shook ten times. That's aggravated.

  Or I may shoot him once out of anger and call 911. That might be potentially mitigating. It's kind of the opposite, something that lessens my moral blameworthiness.
  - A. There you go.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Is that something that you think you can keep an open mind to?
- A. Yeah. I thought I was pretty openminded until I got married.
- Q. As a newlywed myself, I tend to agree with you. But, I mean, in all seriousness, Mr. Ingle, we talk to people who say if I have convicted somebody of capital murder, I found they were a future danger, found they anticipated, there's nothing -- nothing that could ever come up that I would think is mitigating. My mind is closed. I'm going to answer no to that question every time.

And, of course, if you feel like that, you just wouldn't be a fair juror. You wouldn't be able to give both sides a fair trial. So that's why it's important when we talk to people, they can tell us, and really mean

it, they can keep an open mind and follow the law when you get down to Special Issue No. 3. Is that something that you feel you can do? I think I can. Okay. If I don't ask you this question, they probably are. But whenever lawyers hear "I think I can", we always kind of deal with black and white and yes or no. Α. All right. Do you think that you can keep an open mind to ο. that? Α. I can keep an open mind --Okay. There you go. Q. -- to both sides. Α. And that's all we're asking, somebody who Q. doesn't prejudge. Α. Right. Ο. Didn't come into this with preformed opinions. Does that kind of scheme that we have make sense to you about the two parts and then the three questions? Α. Sure. 0. Kind of understand where we're coming from and what's required of being openminded and be a fair juror? Α. Yes. Let me talk to you a little bit about just 0.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

some things, some laws, we have that apply in any criminal

case. Have you ever been on a jury before?

- A. No, sir.
- Q. Okay. But you will probably be familiar with this stuff. All criminal defendants are presumed innocent. That means legally.
  - A. Exactly.

10

11

12

1,3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. We presume him innocent. As he sits there right now, he's presumed innocent. If we all broke camp right now and went home, you know, he would be found not guilty. It's up to us to prove to a jury beyond a reasonable doubt that he's guilty.

We have the burden of proof. It's up to us to do the proving. That burden of proof never shifts to this table. You know, these folks are fine lawyers. You will probably hear from them. But legally you don't have to, because they have no burden. They can sit there and do crossword puzzles all day, if they wanted to. But it's up -- we do the accusing, so we have to do the proving, type of thing.

As a part of that, a person charged, a criminal defendant, is not required to testify in their own defense. That's the Fifth Amendment. You probably heard about it. No one can make him take the stand and testify if he doesn't want to. If he wants to testify, no one can keep him off the stand.

But if he doesn't testify, what the Judge will tell you the law is, is that you as a juror can't consider that for any reason at all. It's just got to be a nonfactor that he didn't testify. You can't hold it against him or start thinking, boy, I wonder why he didn't take the stand. Or, if I was there, I'd take the stand and tell the jury my side of the story. It's natural to think that.

- A. I don't know about that.
- Q. Okay. But legally you just can't hold it against him. Does that make sense to you?
  - A. Right, uh-huh, yes.
  - Q. Does that sound like something you can do?
  - A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Okay. We talked about police officers earlier. You mentioned that you feel that -- felt pretty strongly that they may deserve a little bit extra protection.
  - A. Respect.
- Q. Respect for the job they do. We have alleged that a police officer has been killed in this case. You probably are going to hear from police officer witnesses.

  Okay?

What the law says about that is this, that jurors can't give police officer witnesses more credibility just because they are police officers, just

because they walk in the court wearing a badge and gun and uniform. The law says that you have to start them off with that same level of credibility. You start listening to them and you believe they are credible, then you can believe them. But you just can't give them that extra headstart or that extra leg up of credibility. Does that make sense to you?

A. Don't make no difference to me.

Q. Okay. Another potential type witness you may hear from is a psychiatrist or psychologist or something like that, a mental health professional. Sometimes in these death penalty cases either side can call one. So we always have to make sure potential jurors like you can keep an open mind to their testimony.

We talk to a lot of people and kind of two ends of the spectrum and a group in the middle. One end says, I believe, you know, I believe them. They walk on water. Every word out of their mouth is solid gold. And the other end says it's all magic and hokus pokus. I don't believe it. It's a waste of money. I wouldn't believe a word a psychiatrist or psychologist told me.

The group we're kind of looking for is in the middle, that could be fair, kind of like with police officers. And I'll just wait and listen and see what they have to say.

If it makes sense, I'll go with it. And if it doesn't, I
won't, that I could have that open mind.

And we have a lot of strong feelings one

And we have a lot of strong feelings one way or the other, but where do you kind of put yourself on that scale?

- A. I respect people for getting an education.
- Q. Could you keep an open mind, if you heard from a psychiatrist or psychologist and kind of start them off on that same level?
  - A. Yeah.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Okay. So you are not automatically going to discount what they have to say?
- A. I think it's his opinion based on a little bit more education than others, basically.
- Q. So you would keep that open mind to it? If it makes sense to you, you would consider it and if it didn't, you wouldn't?
  - A. Right.
  - Q. Okay.
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Mr. Ingle, the packet you have in front of you, I think on the back of the very last page, if you would flip to it. There should be something there called the True Bill of Indictment. Do you see it there?
  - A. Yes, sir.

Q. That's basically -- we call it an indictment, but it's, basically, the official legal paper that charges him with a crime. And it kind of -- if you read through it, a certain person, Patrick Murphy, on a certain day in a certain county, basically, committed capital murder. We have kind of said he committed it two different ways. He shot a police officer in the course of his duties and that he also killed someone during the course of a robbery. We can allege it two different ways. If we prove one or both, he would be guilty of capital murder.

But each one of those is broken down into different elements of the crime. We have to prove a certain person on a certain day killed a certain person in a certain way and those are elements that we have to prove. It's part of our burden of proof. We have to prove each and every element that we allege in that indictment. Does that kind of make sense to you?

A. Uh-huh.

Q. I know it's not something that you sit around thinking about. But kind of the bottom line is, we don't get partial credit. You know, we can't go nine for ten or eight for ten and get a guilty or meet our burden of proof. We have to prove each and every element. In the eyes of the law, one of those elements isn't any more important or less important than another one. Okay?

So I'll give you kind of a crazy example. Let's say that Mr. Shook and I are in trial, trying a capital murder that happened in Grand Prairie, Texas. you may know, some of Grand Prairie is in Dallas County and some is in Tarrant County. We go to trial. We think it happened in Dallas County. We don't do our homework. cops are lazy. They don't do their job. We're lazy. We don't do our job.

You get down here as a juror and you listen to the case and there's no doubt the defendant committed a capital murder, but the evidence shows that it actually happened in Tarrant County and not Dallas County. And in that situation we would have failed to prove Okay? to you one of the elements of the crime.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You know, in the eyes of the law one element is no less or more important than the others. And the law would require you to find that person not quilty because we didn't do our job. We didn't meet our burden of proof.

Now, we would get fired, cops would get fired, if we were that negligent and didn't do our job. But the law would require that you as a juror would find that person not guilty.

A lot of people don't like that. We talk to a lot of people and they start crossing their arms like

you are and say, Mr. Wirskye, you are letting a murderer go free on a technicality. And a lot of people feel that way.

But --

- A. I didn't know that was why I crossed my arms, but --
- Q. Usually people cross their arms when I get to this.
- A. I wouldn't disagree. It makes perfect sense to me in the legal sense of things.
- Q. So you could follow that law and find him not guilty, if we didn't prove all our elements?
  - A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Okay. We allege in that indictment that he's killed by a knife and it turns out he's killed by a gun.

You would find him not guilty because we haven't met one of our elements, the way he was killed, and that type of thing?

Let me talk to you a little bit about a life sentence. You know, there's only two possible punishments for capital murder, either the death penalty, that we've talked about, and an automatic life sentence, if you don't get the death penalty.

If you are a juror, the Judge will tell you and the law will tell you what a life sentence means.

Okay? In Texas a life sentence means a person will do forty years day for day, week for week, forty calendar hard years,

before that person would become eligible for parole. Okay? They may not make parole after forty. They may serve out a whole hard life sentence or they may make parole the first time after forty years.

But the law tells you this, then, the very next line tells you, you can't consider it. Okay? And let me tell you why. You know, we talked about using that mental discipline and working through the questions to come to the right answer. We don't want people to say forty years, man, that's a long time. I'm satisfied with that. So I'm not even going to worry about answering these questions, really. I'm going to answer them in such a way that he gets that life sentence, okay, because I'm satisfied with forty years.

We -- also, the flipside of that is we don't want people thinking forty years, that's not long enough. I never want him getting out and because of that I'm going to answer these questions in such a way that he gets the death penalty. I'm not really going to work through the facts and the evidence. Does that kind of make sense to you?

A. Yes.

Q. We kind of ask jurors to kind of assume that life means life because he may make parole at forty and he may not. He may serve a hard life sentence. But we require

you to kind of think that life means life. Does that make sense to you?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And you wouldn't consider any of that -- you would be able to make that assumption; is that right?
  - A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Okay. Let me give you another example. Let's say we have a capital murder case, allege that robbery happened, and somebody got killed during the course of that robbery, that the murder -- robbers shot and killed somebody.

And we go to trial and there becomes some doubt that a murder actually happened, okay, or what particularly caused the death, okay? So there might be reasonable doubt about whether this person committed a murder during a robbery, but there may not be any doubt that that person committed robbery, you know, the lesser offense. So you may have an option as a juror to convict someone of a lesser offense, if that's what you think he's guilty of.

You may have an opportunity in that first phase of the trial to find someone guilty of capital murder, find them guilty of an aggravated robbery, or find them not guilty. Does that kind of make sense to you, that scheme?

- A. Yeah.
- Q. And we call this aggravated robbery a lesser

included offense because it's lesser in punishment. And it's kind of included within the capital murder of that aggravated robbery. Aggravated robbery in Texas is a first-degree felony and you can punish someone anywhere from five years in the penitentiary all the way up to 99 years or life. You have got that full range of punishment.

And I don't know if this is ever going to come into play in this case, but we need to talk about it just a little bit, because there's that possibility there that you may convict someone of that lesser offense of aggravated robbery.

In order to be a qualified juror at this point, you need to be able to tell us that I could keep an open mind to the full range of punishment for aggravated robbery, from five years all the way up to life, just depending on what the facts and circumstances showed in either phase of the trial or both phases. I could assess that appropriate punishment. Does that make sense to you?

A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Could you keep an open mind to that full range of punishment, five all the way up to life?
  - A. Yes, sir.
  - Q. Or aggravated robbery?
  - A. Yes, sir.
  - Q. Do you have any questions for me? I know I

have thrown a lot at you. You are starting to look like you're tired of hearing me talk.

- A. That's why I folded my arms, that, and it's just tight up here. I mean, I'm kind of a big guy and --
  - Q. It's tough on big guys.
- A. But, anyway, no, I don't have -- I don't think I have any questions.
- Q. Do you feel that you are the type person that could be fair in this case and give both sides a fair trial?
  - A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Not going to prejudge it in any way?
- A. Correct.
- Q. Because it sounds like you feel pretty strongly about the death penalty; is that right?
  - A. If it's appropriate.
  - Q. Okay.

MR. WIRSKYE: I'll pass the witness.

#### CROSS-EXAMINATION

# BY MR. SANCHEZ:

Q. Mr. Ingle, my name is Juan Sanchez and I represent Mr. Murphy here. And as you know, you are down here on the case where the State is seeking the death penalty, right? So literally it's a life and death question that you may have to answer, if you are chosen on this jury. Okay?

And a lot of times, you know, I think we as attorneys ask questions of people and we phrase them in a certain way where we give you the answer that we want to get from you. Attorneys are notorious for that. And sometimes people don't like being in front of them.

But my job here is to find out your true feelings. You have answered some questions today where you indicated that you may be able to do something and, as Mr. Wirskye said, you know, that leaves the question open to, I may not be able to do something.

A. Right.

- Q. And as you can appreciate, we're dealing with a life and death situation here. And we would rather have you err on the side of caution. Okay? In other words, sometimes it's better to put yourself in a position or not put yourself in a position where you may not be able to do something if you are not sure that you can do it. Does that make sense?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And I appreciate you for answering loudly so we can hear you. But our job is to get your true feelings. You know, I think everybody wants to say they are fair. Everybody wants to say they can follow the law. But in reality, I mean, that's just questions. You say legally you can be fair, but in reality, you know, based on your

feelings, you may not be able to do certain things. And does that make sense to you?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay.
- A. I get into this mode of this wife thing throws everything off. I think I know a lot of things.
- Q. Your wife tell you, you don't have an open mind?
  - A. No.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. I've been married for seven years and three kids.
- A. I think I have an open mind. I think I have a lot of things that somebody else might not think I have.
- Q. I have to be careful what I say about my wife. She's a lawyer down here and I don't want her walking in here and hearing what I'm saying.
- A. I have an open mind and I think that I'm a fair guy myself.
- Q. I think that I'm an openminded guy, but there are situations in life where I'm not openminded, whether it comes to things like about children I may not be as openminded as I thought I might be, depending on the situation. You might not be as openminded as you think you are or other people. That's the reason that we go through this process, so we can find out what people really think so

it will give us an idea of who is going to sit on the jury and make that life and death decision.

So the one area that I want to cover is, you have indicated on your questionnaire and you have indicated on questions that you have strong feelings when there's a police officer involved. Would that be fair to say?

- A. I respect police officers, highly respect. I give them the benefit of the doubt. I mean, yes -- no, sir, you are right and I'm wrong.
  - Q. And I understand.
  - A. Now --

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. And that's what I want to explore a little with you. Because --
- A. Not that they may always be right, but I'm going to give them the benefit of the doubt.
- Q. I understand. Because of your strong feelings about police officers and if you were to find somebody guilty of killing a police officer in the course of their duties, do you think a life sentence would ever be appropriate for somebody like that that you found guilty of killing a police officer?
- A. I think it was a human being, number one, and the circumstances surrounding it, would indicate life or death, I guess.

- Q. Okay. And would you be able to consider life?

  Do you think it would ever be appropriate?
- A. I would consider the evidence and if it was appropriate either way, I would try to make a decision based on what I've heard from both sides as a party.
- Q. Another thing I want to talk to you about is these Special Issues that we've talked about. Like the State said, it's a trial first. And if you find the person guilty of capital murder, then you have to consider these issues that you have in front of you.

And you have indicated that you would hold the State to proving issue No. 1 and issue No. 2, correct? You would make the State prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt that the person was a continuing threat to society; and issue No. 2, you would make them prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the person that you found guilty anticipated that a human life would be taken?

I mean, I'm kind of paraphrasing those issues, but you have indicated that you would make them prove that to you; is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And then we get to Special Issue No. 3. Neither side has a burden. They don't have to prove to you that there is no mitigating issues and we don't have to prove to you that there are. Of course, we may want to do

that, okay?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, a lot of times in answering Special Issue No. 3, I mean, that's the last step before someone can receive the death penalty. People would like to hear from the accused or the defendant. What do you think about that?

- A. I think that's probably why I have a lawyer for him to tell me whether to or not -- so you know what, I go with what that lawyer -- if a lawyer told me to keep my mouth shut, I'm going to keep my mouth shut. And I believe that's probably the best policy no matter what the deal is. I don't know.
  - Q. You can, no matter what the deal is.
  - A. I don't know.
  - Q. You can more importantly --
- A. I believe, you know, that's why you are sitting there and that's why you are sitting there and there's not -- it's not necessary unless maybe you think it's necessary or --
- Q. And that's what I want to find out, if you think it's necessary?
  - A. I don't think it's necessary.
- Q. Okay. And you are talking about as far as us doing our job, whether we would advise him to take the stand or not, correct? But what about yourself?
  - A. This is not us. It's between y'all. I don't

have any -- it's not -- I don't -- that's not a part of it as far as I'm concerned. If he wanted him to and you want him to, fine. But I'm not expecting him to say anything, if that's what you are asking me.

- Q. What I'm asking you, if you sit on the jury and you get down to Special Issue No. 3, would you want him to get up and argue for his life?
- A. I would have to come up with some mitigating issues in my mind and I don't know whether I would need him to say anything or not based on what I've heard.
- Q. And if you didn't hear from him, you wouldn't hold it against him in any way?
  - A. I don't think -- no, no, I wouldn't.
- Q. Sometimes we don't phrase questions the right way or sometimes we don't even think of asking things that might affect people to sit in a jury on a case like this. Is there anything that we haven't asked? We've talked to you for a long time, but is there something that you can tell this Court or you can tell us that would keep you from being fair on this case? Something that in your background, something -- an experience that you have had, a way of thinking, moral grounds, something that would keep you from being fair to Mr. Murphy as he sits here today?
  - A. No.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. That's a short answer.

1	A. Pardon?
. 2	Q. That was a short answer.
,3	A. I'm keeping it easy on her.
4	MR. SANCHEZ: That's all the questions I
5	have.
6	THE COURT: Thank you, sir. If you
7	would, I need to have you stand outside just for a few
8	moments and we'll have you back.
9	THE COURT: What says the State?
10	MR. WIRSKYE: The State has no challenge
11	for cause.
12	MR. SANCHEZ: We have no challenges for
13	cause.
14	THE COURT: Would you like to step into
15	your office?
16	(Recess)
17	THE COURT: What says the State?
18	MR. SHOOK: State will accept the juror.
19	THE COURT: State accepts.
20	MR. SANCHEZ: We accept the juror.
21	THE COURT: He will be our No. 2 juror.
22	Ask him to come in.
23	[Prospective juror in]
24	THE COURT: Thank you. You may be
25	seated. Mr. Ingle, I'm going to inform you that you have

been selected to sit on this jury. And we will go through the next phase of this process. The Sheriff will go over some things with you and I have a document that I need you to look at. I'm going to provide some juror instructions for you.

The first thing that will happen when you go back to work and you tell them I got selected to sit on a capital murder case, they are going to want to share their opinions with you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No

THE COURT: You know what I'm talking

about?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I know what you're talking about.

THE COURT: Talk shop. And the lawyers like your honest opinion. And if you can just block out -- if you are going back and tell someone, then they are going to share with you. So my instructions I'm giving you, will tell you, please just tell them I have to arrange my schedule to work on the second shift or whatever beginning November 10th for a couple of weeks and leave it at that. Just tell them I've got jury duty and leave it alone.

Hardest thing I think that you have already indicated is your wife. Tell her the same thing. I've been selected to this jury. I can't talk with you

few things.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Here's some instructions that I will give These are the parking instructions to get you now. reimbursed for your parking downstairs. This is a supplemental information sheet to be sure that I have got all your personal information, we haven't made any errors in the numbers and so forth, and especially check the e-mail.

This information is retained by me in my computer. You understand, I'm not going over this on the record because it's going to be in the Sheriff's control to get your information. That is for your protection. enough?

> PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. So with that, if you would, the Sheriff has some things to go over with you in the back. You will receive another summons from me sometime before the November 10th date. You will come back down here for about a one-hour orientation with all the jury. We're going to put everybody in the box together. That way, when we start on November 10th, one thing that you can ask the Sheriff about is I respect your time. letter said half a day. You are going to be out of here before lunch. When we say we will start at 8:30 on Monday

morning the 10th, I'm not talking about you coming down here and having donuts and coffee and getting in the back at 11:00. You will be in that box at 8:30. We will be ready to go to work. The way we get there is we have the orientation a week to ten days beforehand to get all your questions answered, all the procedures down, and get the Sheriff on line with you. Fair enough? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Uh-huh. THE COURT: Okay. Go with the Sheriff and we'll see you down the road. Thank you, sir. [Prospective juror out] (Recess) THE COURT: Frankie Jean Freeland. [Prospective juror in] THE COURT: Thank you. You may be seated. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you. THE COURT: Good afternoon. How are you? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Fine, I think. THE COURT: Is it Frankie Jean Freeland? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Correct. THE COURT: Welcome to the 283rd.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

want to be sure, did you have enough time to review the

guide I provided for you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I did.

THE COURT: I know we put an awful lot of law in front of you during a short period of time.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, there is.

THE COURT: And we don't expect you to know all of that coming in. And the attorneys will spend time with you this afternoon and visit with you and try to educate you on the law, give you examples, to help you understand how it works, because it all interrelates.

And my job is to be sure at the end that you understand the law, number one. Number two, can you follow the law? That's my job here.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.

THE COURT: This is about as informal as we can get. I know many people feel they are the one on trial. Nerves are high because you haven't been through this process before and we understand that. So we try to make you as comfortable as we can. The attorneys are certainly not going to ask you any trick questions. There are no wrong answers, only truthful answers.

The only question that I have for you, ma'am, in reviewing the guide, do you have any questions about the law which you have before we begin?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: Will you have any trouble

serving the Court for the two weeks beginning November 10th?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir.

THE COURT: Very well. Mr. Shook?

### FRANKIE FREELAND,

having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

# DIRECT EXAMINATION

# BY MR. SHOOK:

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

- Q. Ms. Freeland, I'll be asking you questions on behalf of the State. Have you been down for jury selection before?
  - A. Yes, sir, I have.
- Q. You probably know from that experience that we usually choose the jurors from just the large panel.
  - A. Correct.
- Q. We use this procedure because it's a death penalty case. But we're just interested, as the Judge said, in your honest opinions. And if you have any questions at any time, feel free to ask. I have reviewed your questionnaire and I'll be asking you some questions from that. And, obviously, we'll talk to you about -- in depth how you feel about the death penalty and laws that apply to this type of case.

You know from the Judge's first talk and reading the questionnaire, that this case involves an

incident that happened at the Oshman's back on December 24, 2000, and it got a lot of publicity.

- A. Correct.
- Q. So every juror has heard something about it, some more than others. So we explore that with each juror. And you live in Irving, and it looks like you were pretty familiar with some of the facts in that particular store; is that right? The Oshman's itself?
  - A. I've read about it.
  - Q. Have you ever been in the Oshman's?
  - A. Not this particular one, no.
- Q. Okay. But you are aware that there is a street named after it?
  - A. Correct.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. What do you remember about the case itself?
- A. Actually, all I remember is that an alarm had gone off or something, that Officer Hawkins had answered that alarm, and subsequently during his investigation or walking through the store, he came upon these people and he was shot and ran over. That's basically my knowledge of it.
- Q. Do you remember anything about what happened after that incident?
  - A. Um --
  - Q. Arrests or anything of that nature?
  - A. I do remember them being -- leaving town and

the manhunt being on for them and trying to, you know, find where they were and when they were arrested. And I think one committed suicide or something; is that correct? And, you know, that they were all brought -- eventually brought back for trial.

- Q. Did you follow any of the subsequent court proceedings?
  - A. No, I have not.

1,0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Okay. The law is that the simple fact that you have heard or read something or seen something on TV doesn't disqualify you. We don't expect you to put it out of your mind. It's that if you sat on the jury, though, you would have to decide the case based on the evidence you hear in the courtroom. Some people can do that. Other people, a few people, have told us, you know, they have already formed opinions about what they read, saw, or heard. Most people can follow that instruction.

Would you be able to follow that Court's instruction and determine this case just based on the facts?

- A. I believe so.
- Q. Okay. Let's talk for a minute about how you feel about the death penalty. Are you in favor of it as a law?
  - A. Yes, I am.
  - Q. Can you just tell me the reason you favor it,

the purpose you feel it serves society?

- A. I feel the death penalty is warranted in cases like this where a police officer is performing his duty. I believe in the death penalty when it's a particularly heinous crime where someone is decapitated or, you know, children, in the case of death of children and where somebody plans to kill someone, that kind of thing.
- Q. Have you always been in favor of the death penalty as a law since you were an adult?
  - A. Yes, I have.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Okay. In Texas there are only certain types of cases which are eligible for the death penalty. There are murder cases plus something else, some other aggravating fact, such as murder that occurs during the course of a felony.
  - A. Correct.
- Q. During a robbery, burglary, arson, or rape.

  Also murder of a police officer or fireman or prison guard on duty, murder of a child under the age of six.
  - A. Correct.
- Q. Murder for hire, someone does it for money, and murder of more than one victim. Those are the specific types of cases that have been reserved for the death penalty.

Let me go over another area with you.

When we talk about the death penalty, we usually think of examples involving the actual triggerman. But capital murder, like any other law, has situations where more than one person may be involved. An accomplice is the word we use. We call them parties to an offense.

An example would be if Mr. Wirskye and I and another individual decided to go rob a bank and our plan was for me to take in the guns to threaten the tellers.

Mr. Wirskye would go in with a bag and he would gather the money up while I held guns on the tellers, where our third accomplice stayed outside where the -- with the car running and honk the horn if the police were coming and speed off with us.

During the course of that robbery, if I started shooting the tellers, maybe they were going for an alarm or I didn't like them or got mad or whatever reason. We were all able to get away and then arrested later. I, obviously, could be prosecuted for the death penalty because I'm the triggerman. But under the law Mr. Wirskye and the getaway driver could also be prosecuted under certain facts, if they were actively participating in the crime as accomplices, even though they weren't the triggerman. In fact, they could be convicted of capital murder and could ultimately receive the death penalty, depending on the facts under the law, depending on particular facts, if they are

the nontriggermen.

But people feel differently about that and we want to explore that in great detail because a lot of people are fine with the death penalty applying to a triggerman, but not an accomplice. They may as far as someone's role as an accomplice and that type thing, they may have a very stiff prison sentence, but they don't feel the death penalty is a justified type sentence. They disagree with that aspect. Or if it were up to them they would hand them a different type punishment than the death penalty.

Other people agree with the law and think those type people should be prosecuted for the death penalty.

I want to know how you feel generally about the law as far as how the death penalty applies to an accomplice, a nonshooter, a nontriggerman.

- A. I'm not real sure how I feel about it. I don't -- of course, definitely the triggerman.
  - Q. You have no problem with that aspect?
- A. No. The driver, if he's aware that guns are going in there and there's a possibility, then I would have to look at him, you know, at all of them. If the guns were taken in without his knowledge, then that might be something different.

- A. If they were strongly involved, yes.
- Q. Okay. You said when we asked you on the questionnaire, and I think you have a copy of it there, on page 4 we ask one question towards the bottom, I think the second last to the bottom. What would be important to you in deciding whether a person received a death or life sentence in a capital murder case? And you said hard evidence, not hearsay.
  - A. Correct.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. What did you mean by that exactly?
- A. Hard evidence that you could actually prove that they were there, you know, not just somebody talking about, saying, well, I know he was there or -- it would be someone would have to have seen him there, proven in some way other than just people talking about.
- Q. I want to ask you on page 5, the next page, we asked a series of questions and make some statements and ask if you strongly agree all the way down to strongly disagree. In the middle we put uncertain.

And the first statement was, most criminals are actually victims of society's problems and you

put uncertain on that. I wanted to follow up on that. What were you thinking there, if you recall?

A. I believe that society plays a role in a person's conscience, maybe, and their rearing. But I also believe that once a person reaches the age of accountability and has dealt with the public and society, he learns what's right and what's wrong and by that time he should be able to adhere to those laws or to society's rules, I guess you would say.

And that's -- but I do know that your upbringing can have some problems for you.

- Q. And on prosecutors just above that you put underpaid sometimes, but sometimes not thorough in preparedness.
  - A. Preparedness.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Was there a specific example you know of or a case you followed or have known of?
- A. Yes. I think this was basically from a friend of mine whose son actually was brought up on some charges and the -- it was a court appointed and it seems like they didn't really get all the facts. They didn't take the time to get all the facts. And his court-appointed attorney didn't seem to spend enough time preparing for the, you know, trial.
  - Q. What kind of case was that?

Α. Robbery. Was that here in Dallas? No. So the prosecutor didn't seem to get all the facts and then you also had some problems with the court-appointed lawyer, also? A. Right. What happened in that trial? A. He got sentenced -- he went to jail. 10 Q. Do you think he was treated fairly or do you think they could have gone through the process a little more 11 thoroughly in your mind from what you knew about it? 12 13 Α. Um, you know, I wasn't there during the trial, so T --14 Just getting your information? 15 Q. Α. Yeah. 16 So much of mine would be secondhand, so I would hate to make a judgment on it. 17 You also had a friend from the Houston area Q. 18 that had a criminal case. You put down friend that I 19 believe was charged and convicted of rape; is that right? 20 21 A. Where are you reading from? Q. 22 On page 6. 23 Α. Correct.

24

25

Q.

How long ago did that happen?

Tell us a little bit more about those details.

1	A. Oh, many, many years ago, that was probably 25
2	years ago.
3	Q. What relationship were you to this person?
4	A. Just knew him through the church.
5	Q. Did you know much about the facts of his case?
6	A. No.
7	Q. Or what happened down there?
8	A. Only from talking to his mother, no.
9	Q. Have you kept in touch with him after he was
10	
11	A. When he was discharged, yes, I stayed in touch
12	with him for a while. He came out of prison and he seemed
13	like he was a decent young man. I don't know. I find it
14	hard to say that anyone that commits rape is a decent
15	person, but
16	Q. Did he talk to you much about his prison
17	experience?
18	A. You know, he really didn't. Maybe he just
19	didn't want to dwell on it.
20	Q. Okay.
21	MR. SHOOK: May we have one moment,
22	Judge?
23	THE COURT: You may.
24	(Bench conference)
25	MR. SHOOK: That's all the questions that

```
I have, Ms. Freeland.
                        THE COURT: No questions?
                        MS. BUSBEE: No, Your Honor.
                        THE COURT: Ms. Freeland, we want to
    thank you for your honesty and coming down and spending time
    with us and filling out the questionnaire. The parties have
    agreed to excuse you from your jury service. You are free
    to go.
            Thank you.
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                            Thank you.
10
                             [Prospective juror out]
11
                        THE COURT: Ms. Krupihnski.
12
                             [Prospective juror in]
13
                        THE COURT: Good afternoon.
14
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: How are you?
15
                        THE COURT:
                                    I'm doing fine. We've been
    playing name that tune on how we pronounce your name.
16
    Krupihnski?
17
18
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Very good.
19
                       THE COURT: Close enough?
20
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Uh-huh.
21
                       THE COURT:
                                   Please have a seat.
                                                         Have you
    had enough time to preview the guide that I provided for
22
    you?
23
24
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                            Yes.
25
                       THE COURT: And a copy of the
```

questionnaire that you filled out for us Friday back in May?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: A short questionnaire, what is your name, where were you born, and what happened next? So we don't anticipate that you remembered all the answers to the questions provided so if you need to refer to that, please do.

This could be an intimidating process.

It's not designed to be. It's as informal as best we can.

We don't want you to feel like you are the one on trial. My
job is to be sure that you understand the law. I've given
you as short a version as I can of the issues that the
lawyers will be talking about and they will give you
examples. If you don't understand the examples, we'll
explain it so that you can understand how all the law
relates with each other. That's the main thing, to get you
up to speed on the type of law we're dealing with. Number
one, do you understand it? Number two, can you follow the
law?

So before we go any further, after reviewing the guide, do you have any questions about what you have read so far?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: All right. Do you have any problems serving the Court for two weeks of jury duty

beginning on November 10th? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I sure do not. THE COURT: Very well. I shall turn it over to Mr. Shook. SUSANNE KRUPIHNSKI, having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. SHOOK: 10 Q. Krupihnski, that is right? A. 11 Yes. My name is Toby Shook. I'm going to speak to 12 Ο. you on behalf of the State. Looking at your questionnaire, 13 I believe this is your first tour of jury duty; is that 14 right? 15 Yes. Here in Texas or ever. 16 Α. 17 0.

- Okay. So you went right up to the --
- A. Uh-huh.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. You skipped the minor leagues and went to the major leaques?
  - Α. Yes.
- Usually in every other case, except the death penalty case, we talk to jurors in general. But because it is a case in which the State is seeking the death penalty, we do this individual process. And it's, as the Judge

alluded, it's not made to intimidate you, although it kind of makes you feel like you are on trial. We've had jurors tell us that. But it's the best way we found to get information.

You provided a lot of information with your questionnaire and I'm going to follow up on some of that.

A. Okay.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. We're going to talk about how you feel about the capital murder death penalty and some of the rules and laws that apply to that and all criminal cases. You have lived, I think, here in the Dallas area for about the last three years?
  - A. Yeah, it's four years this month.
  - Q. Okay. And prior to that it was Florida?
  - A. Orlando, uh-huh.
- Q. Let me ask you first about how you feel about the death penalty, and I believe you put on the questionnaire that you are in favor of it as a law. And I would like you to kind of follow up on that, give us a little information as to why you favor the death penalty and the purpose you feel it serves society. It doesn't have to be a long answer, just general feelings.
- A. I just don't believe in murdering other people and I think if you do that, you pay the ultimate price with

your own life.

- Q. So you feel it's the proper punishment in certain types of murder cases?
  - A. Yes, I do.
- Q. Would that all just come down to the particular facts of the case, the type of murder, that sort of thing?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. Okay. If it's intentional?
  - A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Okay. If it's -- and I take it it's a law that you have kind of grown up with or always believed in it?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. In Texas -- every state is a little different. In Texas the death penalty is just reserved for murder cases, but not every murder case, just certain types of murder cases. When we talk about murder, we are talking about an intentional killing. But there's lots of different types of intentional killings, brutal killings, you can't get the death penalty for. You can get a life sentence or 99 years, but not the death penalty. There are certain rules that we have to go by which the Supreme Court has handed down. Kind of limits us to which type case that we can go for.

We had to put some criteria on the death penalty, so what we're limited to right now is intentional killings that occur during the course of a felony such as a robbery. Someone goes in and robs a 7-Eleven, killing the clerk, that could be a death penalty case. During a burglary, during a rape, during an arson, those, or kidnapping. Those could be a death penalty case, again, depending on the facts makes you eligible for the death penalty.

I guess you could say murder of specific victims, such as a police officer, fireman on duty, child under the age of six, multiple murders, several victims, mass killer or serial killer. And then a murder for hire, hitman-type situation.

But those are simply the types of cases that have been reserved for the death penalty. Lots of other bad killings deserve the death penalty, but going under the rules handed down from the Supreme Court, that's what Texas is limited to.

Then if you committed that type of crime under our procedure, that doesn't mean I get the death penalty. It depends on the facts of each case and the Special Issues which I believe you looked over from that --

A. Uh-huh.

Q. -- the juror orientation. Those have to be

answered a certain way before someone can get the death penalty. Some are answered that way and some aren't, depending on each case. It comes down to each particular case.

The way the death penalty is set up right now for the types of murders I've gone over where a person could be eligible for the death penalty, do you agree generally that those are the types of crimes --

A. Yes.

Q. -- that you think should be considered? Okay. Here's another area I want to get into, what is called the law of parties. I think it's more commonly known as accomplices. You know, when we think of a death penalty case, someone committing capital murder, you immediately envision the actual triggerman and very well may be that.

But also capital murder, like any other crime, can be committed by more than one person, groups of people. Sometimes it takes several people to pull off a certain crime. Some people are more responsible or have a larger role in a crime but that doesn't mean the rest aren't held responsible, if the law says we actively participate in the crime, participate, then we can all be held accountable.

Let me give you an example of capital murder. let's say Mr. Wirskye and I and one other person would be the getaway driver. We come up with a plan to rob

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The plan calls for me to have a couple of guns. get driven to the bank. Our getaway driver waits outside, car running, so we can make a speedy getaway.

Mr. Wirskye and I go in and I pull the guns out and threaten everyone and he gets a bag and starts loading the money up. During the course of that robbery, I start shooting people. Maybe Mr. Wirskye warns me, hey, this one is going for an alarm or that one is trying to get away and I shoot them. Or maybe I start shooting on my own, but I kill people intentionally, kill a person intentionally. We get away, but we're caught.

Obviously, I can be prosecuted for the death penalty because I'm the triggerman. But the law says that Mr. Wirskye and the getaway driver, depending on the facts of the case, could also be found quilty of capital murder, even though they are not the triggerman. be prosecuted because they actively participated in that crime and they ultimately could get the death penalty. Depends on the particular facts of each case, even though they didn't pull the trigger.

Some people don't agree with that area of the law. They would draw a line there and go, look, I'm all for the death penalty for the triggerman, but not an accomplice. Other people tell us, no, I can see where a death penalty could apply in that situation and it would

depend on the facts, obviously, how actively people are involved in the crime. But I can see the logic of pursuing the capital murder, even the death penalty, against a nontriggerman and accomplice. And they agree with the law.

And we just want to know how you feel, generally, about that, prosecuting someone who is a nontriggerman, that is an accomplice to a crime for the death penalty. Personally, do you feel that is something you are on board with, depending on the facts or something you are not on board with?

- A. I would probably be one of the people that would be on the other side that have the opinion.
  - Q. Okay.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. You know, the accomplice may not have understood what the intention was of the person who shot them.
- Q. Okay. So you're fine with the death penalty for the triggerman. It's the accomplice is where you would draw the line?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Well, let me explore that a little bit further with you. Is that something if -- and I can't get into the specific facts, but if you were in a situation where the State were presenting a case with an accomplice, that you would have an objection saying, look, life sentence, fine,

99 years, but no death penalty for the accomplice. If we're talking about the triggerman, it's a whole 'nother matter?

- A. 'Right.
- Q. But the accomplice from the get-go, I'm not on board with that. I'm not saying he would get away.
  - A. Right.
- Q. Long prison term maybe, but that's not what I could reserve the death penalty for and I'm being up front.
  - A. Right, just my own personal feelings.
  - Q. And that's how you feel?
  - A. Uh-huh.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Do you feel that's something you are pretty firm about in your convictions?
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. You are telling us honestly, then, if this were a case -- I can't get into the facts, but I can tell you we are pursuing this case under the law of parties as an accomplice, not a triggerman. That's where you personally would draw the line?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And wouldn't be able to return a verdict of the death penalty, if we're talking about a situation of an accomplice, a nontriggerman?
- A. I guess if it were clear to me that the intention was understood, that a murder was going to take

place, it will be different.

- Q. Well, like the situation I gave, maybe the example I have given, I mean, I just start shooting. Now, I don't know if there's any plan ahead of that, but I don't know how you feel about those fact situations.
  - A. No, I would have difficulty with that.
- Q. Okay. So you would require some agreement to murder ahead of time?
  - A. Uh-huh, yes, sir.
- Q. The accomplice would have to know someone is going to go in there and be killed even before the crime began?
  - A. Yes.

MR. SHOOK: Judge, I believe we have an agreement.

THE COURT: Ms. Krupihnski, we appreciate your honesty, by your answers, obviously, to his questions, the type of law here. I said, you understand the law? Now you do. And can you follow the law? And you say, no, I can't go there. So the parties have agreed to excuse you. We appreciate your time and service here today.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you.

[Prospective juror out]

THE COURT: Ms. Garrett.

[Prospective juror in]

22

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

25

THE COURT: You may have a seat. Ms.

Dona Michelle Garrett?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Uh-huh.

first name Dona or Michelle or Michelle?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Dona.

THE COURT: Okay. D-O-N-A, not

D-O-N-N-A?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's correct.

THE COURT: Ms. Garrett, you go by your

THE COURT: Making sure my records are correct. I know it's kind of tough to say relax a little bit. This is as informal as it gets. Many people come in under a lot of stress and feel like they are the ones on trial. That's not the case.

We're trying to explore the law with you, given you a guide to begin to try to think about the issues we're going to talk about. I know that is -- that's a lot of law to read it and understand it the first time. We don't expect you to. We want you to begin to think about it and the lawyers will explore these issues with you.

If you have questions, please ask us.

The whole idea is for you to understand the law, number one.

Number two, can you follow the law? That's the ultimate issue here. You understand the law and can you follow the law? That will be the last question we ask.

Do you have any questions of me regarding the issues I've presented to you in the guide before we begin?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir.

THE COURT: Are you able to serve this court for two weeks beginning on November 10th?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Wirskye?

## DONA GARRETT,

having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

## **DIRECT EXAMINATION**

## BY MR. WIRSKYE:

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Ms. Garrett, how are you this afternoon?
- A. I'm fine. How are you?
- Q. Good. My name is Bill Wirskye and I'm the assistant DA that will be visiting with you the next couple of minutes, trying to -- sometimes you feel like you are on trial, but you are not. I want to visit with you a little bit, get some of your thoughts and feelings about the death penalty, talk a little bit about some of the information in your questionnaire, and then maybe talk about some of the law and rules that apply to death penalty cases.

If you have any questions at all, just stop me. And we know people usually don't sit around

thinking about these things and we're giving you booklets like a test in school. If there's something you don't understand or something I don't make clear, please stop me because it's probably my fault and not yours.

You have told us you are generally in favor of the death penalty; is that correct?

A. Yes, sir.

- Q. Why is that? What purpose do you think it serves in our society?
- A. Okay. I'll -- I think a lot has to do with the way I was raised from the south. I was raised in a very religious family, Biblical and moral standards, and for me, I mean, I believe in giving people a chance through the system or if they are -- rehabilitation. But there are extenuating circumstances, repetitive crime and behavior, extreme violent acts, violent acts against children or the elderly or disabled, to me are unconscionable and for that reason there has to be limitations placed on individuals.

We need to learn to be responsible for our actions. We know what the consequences are in advance. I know -- I think most people know whatever state they're living in what these laws are and what the repercussions of their actions are. And then I think that we have to hold them accountable. Unfortunately, if there is no accountability and responsibility, then I think society

which is -- would, basically, be unruly. I mean, there would be no one -- no parameters for anyone.

And as a parent with children, parameters are very important. Accountability is responsibility and responsibility is important in raising them to be able to conduct themselves in society.

Q. Okay. You have told us some of the types of cases you think it may be appropriate. Is there any particular case or cases that come to mind? I know you made mention of a couple, I think, in your questionnaire. I think the Susan Smith case and Darlie Routier case?

A. I think maybe not even being a parent, seeing a violent act committed against a defenseless child or disabled or mentally incapable, someone who is physically or mentally unable to defend themselves, again, is unconscionable. These are people that can't protect themselves from you as an adult or you as a parent.

So for me those are extreme cases that definitely the death penalty is warranted if proved beyond a reasonable doubt.

- Q. Would you kind of reserve the death penalty for just those types of extreme cases or --
- A. No. Again, as I said earlier, anyone that is repetitively committing criminal acts and violent acts deserves to be punished.

- Q. Okay. How long have you lived in Texas?
- A. I moved here the end of October, actually October 31, 1995.
  - Q. Okay. From South Carolina?
  - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. And looks like your brother is a police officer in South Carolina?
  - A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. As you may know by now, the allegations in this case involve the murder of a police officer on duty, which just to back up a second, capital murder in Texas is only reserved for certain types of murder cases. Not all murder cases can be subject to the death penalty. You kill a certain person, a police officer, fireman, prison guard on duty, mass murder, serial murder, or commit an intentional murder during the course of another felony like robbery or burglary, those are the type cases that in Texas we reserve for the death penalty.

Obviously, in this case we have alleged a police officer was murdered. What effect do you think it may have on you having a brother who is a police officer in this type of case?

A. Um, it's kind of difficult. I'm learning to be a sister of a police officer. My brother joined the force late in life. It had been his lifetime goal to become

a police officer and I guess it took some time for him to convince his wife and his family that it was okay. So he's actually only been on the force for about a year and a half. He turned forty and made a huge career change.

You know, it's a sensitive subject for anyone, be they sister, mother, daughter, to lose anyone, regardless of what capacity they're serving their country, their state, their job, their family. Whatever their lifestyle is, whatever their job position, I would think it would be very difficult to lose an immediate family member to a violent crime and not have it affect you.

I tend to weigh the evidence -- I mean,
I'm a believer, for whatever it's worth, I weigh the scales.
I try to balance things out. I don't think it would impair
my being able to -- if you are asking whether it would
impair my being able to make a decision or color or slant me
being able to make a decision, I don't think so.

- Q. You know, you said you were learning how to be a police officer's sister. That's what I want to follow up on. We're not all the right type jurors in a case. Only you know in your heart. And, obviously, the law in this case requires the jury to decide it just on the facts and evidence presented in the Court.
  - A. Right. Emotions have to be out of it.
  - Q. And you know yourself better than anyone. You

think that you can do that?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- A. I think I can.
- Q. If I had to pin you down for a yes or no, where do you think you -- if you had to choose yes or no?
- A. Based on who I am and how I live my life, yes,
  I know -- I think I could -- I know I could.
  - Q. You can keep that out of your mind?
- A. I could keep that out of my mind and focus on the facts.
- Q. Okay. Fair enough. Let me ask you this. You told us you were in favor of the death penalty. I think oftentimes when we talk about a death penalty case, we think of one criminal acting alone, one murderer in the real world. There are often groups or gangs of people that commit crimes, even murder. So you may only have a situation where you just have one person that actually pulled the trigger, one person that actually caused the death.

And we talk to a lot of people who are in favor of the death penalty, but for the person that actually committed the death, the person that actually pulled the trigger, and they tend to draw a line sometimes and they don't think the death penalty is necessarily appropriate or ever appropriate for a person that didn't take a life, for the accomplice, for lack of a better word. Am I being

clear?

- A. Uh-huh.
- Q. So I'm just kind of curious where you come down. We talk to a lot of people who think the death penalty is only warranted for someone who has taken a life. And some people, you know, could consider it for an accomplice, someone who didn't pull the trigger. And I'm wondering where you come down on that issue.
- A. I'm probably one of those that would be more than actually taking a life or participating in the act. I don't think for me it would be one of those situations where, okay, we can prove from his gun that it wasn't the actual bullet that killed him, that that would be an issue for me. The fact that the person acted by actually shooting with the intent to harm or cause death would be enough for me to lean towards the death penalty. But if they did not actually participate, again, it would depend on the facts and the situation and the evidence.
  - Q. Let me give you a hypothetical.
  - A. Okay.
- Q. Say Mr. Shook and I decided to rob a bank. We only have one gun. He carries the gun in to hold up the teller. I'm going to go in with the bag and grab the money. And for some reason, just out of pure meanness or somebody is going for a silent alarm, and I tell Mr. Shook that, he

shoots and kills the teller. Okay? He's committed intentional murder during the course of robbery. He could be found guilty of capital murder, depending on the facts and circumstances. He could get the death penalty. What do you think about my situation?

- A. I'm trying to figure out if they participated. I don't think so. I don't think that you are qualified for the death penalty, if it were up to me, because you did not have a weapon. It was not your intention to do anything, other than rob the bank.
  - Q. Okay.

- A. Did I answer you?
- Q. There's no right or wrong answers. We're just trying --
- A. That's my impression. The person that takes the gun and wields the gun and is capable and does use violent measures against another innocent person, I mean, I think you have put yourself in the wrong crowd, of course, and you have put yourself in a situation to be involved with someone. Obviously, he took a gun. He was going to use it, if necessary. He made a decision that he could and would cross the line. You made a decision not to have a gun. You are still committing an act of crime, but he's the one that actually fired the shot that killed someone, so I would not -- I would not personally see that you need to face the

death penalty.

- Q. Okay. You could give me a long prison sentence?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Life in prison, but not the death penalty.

  What if I had a gun? Didn't shoot, he still shot, but I had a gun, too?
  - A. Well, did you call the police and turn him in?
  - O. No.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- A. Okay. I still think that the person that actually perpetuated the crime, the offense, the one that actually murdered the individual, is the one that should face the death penalty. There's severe consequences for the other person, but if they did not fire or shoot, then, no, they should not.
- Q. What our law allows, basically, in the situation I gave, Mr. Shook and I entered into a conspiracy to commit bank robbery. Mr. Shook committed the murder in furtherance of the bank robbery. And even though I had no intention at all of that murder happening, I could still be on the hook for capital murder and in Texas I could still face the death penalty.

And there are some people, very frankly, that disagree with that and that's fine. And that kind of sounds like where you are coming down. The person that does

not have the intent, he's just an accomplice, just signed up for a bank robbery, didn't sign on for capital murder, sounds like you take the death penalty off the table for that kind of person, right?

- A. Well, if it's the state law, then you have to look at the law. I'm just saying me personally. But, again, this is going to tell us how we have to come to a verdict.
- Q. I'm just trying to get how you really feel. For both sides there's no right or wrong answers. The law allows that, but we don't want to put anyone in a hard spot or jam somebody up against their conscience or morals or beliefs --
  - A. Correct.

Q. -- or that type of thing. The law may allow it, but we don't want to have you over in the jury box and have a crisis of conscience. We don't want to do that to anyone.

And we'll be up front with you. This is a case that we're prosecuting as a nontriggerman under the law of parties or the law of accomplice or conspiracy. And it sounds like maybe this, with everything going on, with maybe your brother being in law enforcement, and then the accomplice business, maybe you are probably not the right juror for this case. Is that fair to say?

A. Probably.

MR. WIRSKYE: Give us just a minute.

THE COURT: Ms. Garrett, we appreciate your honesty and coming down and going through the process. You probably learned more about it then you ever dreamed. So the parties have agreed to excuse you, because two questions I said, do you understand the law, number one, and number two, can you follow it?

The bottom line is in this case you indicated that you probably couldn't. So with that, we'll excuse you.

[End of Volume]

\_\_

STATE OF TEXAS

COUNTY OF DALLAS

I, NANCY BREWER, Official Court Reporter for the 283rd Judicial District Court, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing constitutes a true and correct transcription of all portions of evidence and other proceedings requested in writing by counsel for the parties to be included in this volume of the Reporter's Record, in the above-styled and numbered cause, all of which occurred in open court or in chambers and were reported by me.

WITNESS MY OFFICIAL HAND on this the \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2003.

NANCY BREWER, CSR, NO. 5759
Expiration Date: 12-31-04
Official Reporter, 283rd JDC
Frank Crowley Crts. Bldg. LB33
133 No. Industrial Blvd.
Dallas, TX 75207
(214)653-5863

2Ĭ